DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 271 RC 006 953

AUTHOR	Flores, Juan Modesto
TITLE	A Study of Mexican American Cultural Characteristics as Perceived by Members of 100 Impoverished Mexican American Families and its Educational Implications.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	201p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Houston
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Cultural Factors; Educational Strategies; *Ethnic Studies; *Family Attitudes; *Low Income Groups; *Mexican Americans; Self Concept Tests; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

Two questions were investigated in this study: (1) Does the low socioeconomic Mexican American perceive himself as he is portrayed in literature? and (2) Are there relationships between educational achievement, perceived cultural characteristics, and the 7 specific themes: 1) ethnic isolation, 2) Spanish language, 3) fatalism, 4) present day orientation, 5) limited aspirations, 6) "machismo", and 7) family solidarity? A questionnaire was developed for the 100 ninth grade students tested in Corpus Christi while another was administered to the 76 parents. The results indicated that Mexican American cultural characteristics as perceived by 100 low socioeconomic families tested are not in total accordance with literature. There was general agreement on ethnic isolation, Spanish language, family solidarity, and, to some extent, present day orientation, while there seemed to be general disagreement in the areas of fatalism, limited aspirations, and "machismo". The findings showed the Mexican American living in isolation, maintaining the Spanish language, and having strong family ties. He was also prone to function in the present rather than the past or future, was non-fatalistic, had high aspirations and generally disregarded the "machismo" concept. (HBC)

ED 076271

A STUDY OF MEXICAN AMERICAN CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS AS PERCEIVED BY MEMBERS OF 100 IMPOVERISHED MEXICAN AMERICAN FAMILIES AND ITS EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
MAY 30 1973
E.R.I.C.

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

---

by
Juan Modesto Flores
May 1972

RC 006953

638236

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Juan M. Flores

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© Copyright by

Juan Modesto Flores

1972

University of Houston

RECEIVED
MAY 30 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

A STUDY OF MEXICAN AMERICAN CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS AS PERCEIVED BY MEMBERS OF 100 IMPOVERISHED MEXICAN AMERICAN FAMILIES AND ITS EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Juan Modesto Flores

Juan Modesto Flores

APPROVED:

Chairman: June Hyer
June Hyer, Professor,
Foundations of Education

Members: Josephine Sobrino
Josephine Sobrino, Professor,
Spanish

Sam Schulman
Sam Schulman, Professor,
Sociology

Robert B. Howsam, Dean
College of Education

May 1972

LIBRARIES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express special appreciation to his wife, Amelia, and children for their sacrifice, patience and understanding during the development and completion of this study.

Special thanks are due to Mr. and Mrs. Domingo Garza and Mr. and Mrs. Ramon Curiel for their personal interest and support for me and my family at a time when we needed it most.

The writer is deeply indebted to Dr. June Hyer, chairman of his doctoral committee, for her guidance, encouragement and inspiration from the first interview to the end of the program. Sincere appreciation is extended to other members of his committee: Dr. Josephine Sobrino, who gave valuable advice and suggestions in the most gentle way throughout this investigation; Dr. Sam Schulman, whose personal interest, competence as a sociologist and comprehensive knowledge of the Mexican American people were of invaluable assistance; and Dr. Dell Felder, former member of the committee for her expert advice and invaluable suggestions with the early part of the study.

Grateful appreciation is also expressed to Mr. Gonzalo Garza, Mr. Salvador Alvarez, and Mr. Alonso Perales for their criticism concerning the instruments.

University of Houston
Libraries

The writer is also indebted to the Foundations of Education Department personnel, specifically, Dr. Robert McClintock and Dr. Joseph Carbonari, for their assistance in the design and statistics part of the study.

Gratitude is expressed to the ninth grade students at Thomas Edison Junior High School, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas, and their parents for participating in the pilot study. Special thanks are due to the ninth grade students at Ella Barnes Junior High School, Corpus Christi Independent School District, Corpus Christi, Texas, and their parents for their participation in this study.

The writer expresses deep gratitude to Mrs. JoAnn Hunt, who assisted in setting up the computer program; and to the typist, Mrs. Pam Duncan, for her conscientious and untiring efforts; and Mrs. Pauline Oliver, who read, edited and reacted to the manuscript.

The writer wishes to express special appreciation to the excellent staff of the University of Houston Library who were most helpful during the entire program.

Finally, the writer would like to pay a debt of gratitude to the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Houston, who generously provided the student with a research grant during the fall semester of 1971 which facilitated the collection of the data.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

ABSTRACT

Flores, Juan Modesto. "A Study of Mexican American Cultural Characteristics As Perceived By Members Of 100 Impoverished Mexican American Families And Its Educational Implications." Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Houston, 1972.

Committee Chairman: June Hyer

Problem

The specific purpose of this study was to investigate two general basic questions: (1) Does the low socioeconomic Mexican American perceive himself as disclosed in the literature? (2) Are there relationships between educational achievement, perceived Cultural Characteristics and the seven specific themes: 1) Ethnic Isolation, 2) Spanish Language, 3) Fatalism, 4) Present Day Orientation, 5) Limited Aspirations, 6) Machismo, and 7) Family Solidarity?

Procedure

Two questionnaires were developed by this investigator for use with ninth grade students and parents in the Corpus Christi Independent School District. The validity evaluation of the instruments was made by a five member panel of experts who have done extensive work in the field of Mexican American education. The questionnaires were checked for reliability using the test-retest method in the Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas. One hundred randomly

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

page viii missing

Implications, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Ethnic Isolation. The administration, instruction, and facilities in that neighborhood should be just as good as anywhere else in the school district.

Spanish Language. There should be more bilingual personnel who speak and understand Spanish. Communication from school to home should be in Spanish as well as English whenever possible. Schools should assess their communities for the possibility of using a Spanish or a bilingual approach to increase parent participation. More and better bilingual programs need to be implemented with the regular school program.

Fatalism. Schools should have more work-study programs to keep the Mexican American student from dropping out to get a job. More parents should be hired in these schools as aides.

Present Day Orientation. More personalized and individualized programs with short range objectives should be planned in the instruction for the Mexican American students.

Limited Aspirations. More scholarships and work-study programs should be granted by civic organizations and federal grants to encourage the students to stay in school.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

Machismo. Qualified teachers who are sensitive to the needs of the Mexican American students should be assigned to these children regardless of sex or ethnic background.

Family Solidarity. The school should be a focal point of the community to gain the support of the father as well as the mother.

Based upon findings of this study additional studies are recommended in:

1. the investigation of the effect of Headstart on the educational achievement of the Mexican American child.
2. the determination of the effect of bilingual education on the educational achievement of the Mexican American student.
3. the investigation of the effect of ability grouping on the educational achievement of the Mexican American child.

The answer to many of the problems of the Mexican American rests within the educational arena. The problems which exist for the Mexican American student many times go beyond the realm of the classroom. There must be an awareness, a commitment, and an urgent positive action in the social, political, and economical arena so that the "impossible dream" may become a reality for more Mexican American children.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
LIST OF TABLES xiv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1
    THEORETICAL ORIENTATION 1
    PROBLEM 2
    DEFINITION OF TERMS 3
    NEED FOR THE STUDY. 4
    REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. 5
II. THE DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENTS 44
    DEVELOPMENT 44
        Format. 44
        Validity. 47
        Reliability 48
    ADMINISTRATION. 49
        Informants. 49
        Sample Area 49
        Procedure 51
III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. 54
    DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS. 54
        Students and Parents. 54

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

Chapter Page

ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP. 56

Relationship Between Students' Preception of Cultural Characteristics and Educational Achievement. 56

Relationship Between Students' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Sex . . . 61

Relationship Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Educational Level 66

Relationship Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Sex. 71

Relationship Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Income . . . 76

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE. 80

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS' AND PARENTS' RESPONSES. 86

FREQUENCY CODE. 102

IV. FINDINGS. 105

INTRODUCTION. 105

PERCEPTION OF CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS. . . . 106

Relationship Between Perceived Cultural Characteristics and Educational Achievement 107

V. CONCLUSIONS 124

PROBLEM 124

PROCEDURE 124

Instruments 124

Validity. 125

Reliability 125

Informants. 126

Chapter Page

- Sample Area 126
- Method. 127
- FINDINGS. 127
  - Descriptive Analysis. 127
  - Analysis of Relationships 128
  - Analysis of Variance. 130
- RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 132
  - Ethnic Isolation. 132
  - Spanish Language. 132
  - Fatalism. 133
  - Present Day Orientation 134
  - Limited Aspirations 134
  - Machismo. 134
  - Family Solidarity 134
- RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY 134

BIBLIOGRAPHY 136

APPENDICES 144
- Appendix A: Questionnaires and Letters: In English. 145
- Appendix B: Questionnaires and Letters: In Spanish. 172

VITA 187

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

I. Questionnaire: Item 19. 57

II. Questionnaire: Item 40. 57

III. Questionnaire: Item 43. 58

IV. Questionnaire: Item 48. 58

V. Questionnaire: Item 64. 59

VI. Questionnaire: Item 65. 60

VII. Questionnaire: Item 53. 60

VIII. Questionnaire: Item 41. 61

IX. Questionnaire: Item 3 62

X. Questionnaire: Item 39. 62

XI. Questionnaire: Item 27. 63

XII. Questionnaire: Item 60. 64

XIII. Questionnaire: Item 62. 64

XIV. Questionnaire: Item 66. 65

XV. Questionnaire: Item 67. 65

XVI. Questionnaire: Item 41. 66

XVII. Questionnaire: Item 4 67

XVIII. Questionnaire: Item 12. 67

XIX. Questionnaire: Item 25. 68

XX. Questionnaire: Item 27. 68

XXI. Questionnaire: Item 29. 69

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

Table Page
XXII. Questionnaire: Item 55. 70
XXIII. Questionnaire: Item 48. 71
XXIV. Questionnaire: Item 5 72
XXV. Questionnaire: Item 10. 72
XXVI. Questionnaire: Item 65. 73
XXVII. Questionnaire: Item 5 76
XXVIII. Questionnaire: Item 32. 77
XXIX. Questionnaire: Item 44. 77
XXX. Questionnaire: Item 57. 78
XXXI. Questionnaire: Item 65. 79
XXXII. Analysis of Variance: Students and Parents. . 80
XXXIII. Analysis of Variance: Students - Education. . 81
XXXIV. Analysis of Variance: Students - Sex. 82
XXXV. Analysis of Variance: Parents - Education . . 83
XXXVI. Analysis of Variance: Parents - Sex 84
XXXVII. Analysis of Variance: Parents - Income. . . . 85

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

To understand why Juanito does not do as well in school as the children of the dominant culture, one must understand the life style of the *barrios* from whence he comes. To understand the *barrios* one must borrow these people's eyes and hearts so one can see and feel their attitudes toward education. Juanito's problems cannot be resolved in the Mexican American community alone, because by and large, they are not alone the problems of the Mexican American people, but those of the entire American society.

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

Frank Riesman (1962) holds that the effects of cultural deprivation are reflected in the inferior self-concept and limited aspirations exhibited by many "culturally deprived" children. These effects are reflected, too, in the measured intelligence quotients of such children and in the learning difficulties they face in school.

It has been proposed that many Mexican American children are "deprived," or "disadvantaged," and that their home environment has not furnished them with the skills or experiences necessary for success in school. This theory of

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

cultural deprivation or disadvantage theory has provided school people with a plausible account for the poor scholastic performance of Mexican American children.

In the literature, cultural deprivation has been closely, though not uniformly, related to low socioeconomic conditions and these have been encountered in rural areas, in towns and small cities, and notably in large cities.

PROBLEM

It was the major purpose of this study to investigate how the "disadvantaged" or "deprived" Mexican American perceived himself in relation to education. The need for tapping the "grass roots" of the community is important. The following will illustrate this point:

> Reports that the traditional Mexican American devalues education or sees it as a perogative of the aristocracy seem to have little relevance today. Although there is no contemporary, widespread, systematic research that would verify it, there is every indication that as a group, Mexican Americans view education positively, adhering generally to the American belief that 'getting a good education' is a prerequisite of upward social mobility. While the idea of education is well accepted, minority group views of the school, as an institution, may diverge considerably from those of the middle class. Neither the Coleman report (1966) nor the Los Angeles School Study questioned parents directly about their views of education or perceptions of the school. However, children's responses shed some light on the perceptions of their parents (Carter, 1970).

Thus the specific purpose of this study was to investigate two basic questions within the "disadvantaged" Mexican

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

American cultural theoretical framework: (1) Is there a relationship between the selected, cultural characteristics as perceived by "deprived" Mexican Americans and their educational level? (2) Does the Mexican American perceive himself as disclosed in the literature?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Anglo. This term will be interpreted as a person from the dominant culture. Technically it will be applied to the Anglo Saxon.

Culture. The life characteristics of a people.

Mexican American. Those people that identify themselves as Mexican Americans.

Impoverished. As defined by the OEO Income Poverty Guidelines (Revised OEO Instruction, 6004-1b., 1970).

Family Size	Non-Farm Family Income
1	$1,900
2	$2,500
3	$3,100
4	$3,700
5	$4,300
6	$4,900
7	$5,500

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

For families with more than 7 members, add $600 for each additional member in a non-farm family.

Selected urban area. Corpus Christi, Texas, 1970 preliminary census 274,410, was the area selected for study. Mexican Americans make up about half of the population.

Educational achievement. This will be interpreted as ability grouping in English and mathematics. There were three sequences: Enriched, Standard, and Basic. There were many criteria for placement in these groups. Among them were grades, achievement scores, teachers' and counselors' recommendations, and the consent of the parents.

Barrio. A Mexican American neighborhood is referred to as a barrio.

Chicano. This term will be interpreted in this study as a colloquial name for Mexican American. Raul Nava in his book Mexican American: A Brief Look at Their History, pointed out that this word was a small form of "Mexican" as well as a slang term used in Mexico for country hicks. However, the young peoples' movement has given this term a positive meaning. For other terms, see Appendix (page 174).

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The Mexican American population in Texas in the 1960 census was 1,417,810. These persons made up the largest

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

minority in the state (Browning, 1964). The 1970 Advance Census Report of February, 1971, does not give a breakdown on races other than White, Negro, and Other. Mexican Americans are listed as white in this report.

The education of Mexican Americans has lagged behind that of the Anglos and the Negroes in Texas. The drop-out rates compared with enrollments listed the Mexican American with 34 percent, as compared to the Negroes' 27 percent and the Anglos' 19 percent. The 1960 census showed 78.2 percent of Mexican American males between the ages of 20-49 had not graduated from high school as compared to 62.9 percent of Negro males and 34.2 percent Anglo males (Governor's Committee on Public School Education, 1968). As to college education among the residents of the southwest, 6 percent of the Mexican Americans had at least one year of college compared to 12 percent of the Negroes and 22 percent of the Anglos.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of the review of the literature was twofold: (1) It was an examination of theoretical explanations of why the Mexican Americans scored so low academically, and (2) it provided the basis for selecting the Mexican American cultural characteristics used in this study.

One of the basic questions posed by social scientists has been: Why do Mexican Americans have such poor academic achievement? (Vaca, 1970). Was it because he had been born

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

"inferior"? Was it because the school as an institution had been too rigid? Was it because of the school role coupled with the Mexican Americans' "negative cultural baggage?" Or was it primarily the function of the Mexican American cultural "values" which had been in conflict with the roles and expectations of the American school system?

Four major theoretical themes appeared in the current literature selected in an attempt to answer these questions. These four theories had some of the characteristics of other theoretical paradigms. They were based on assumptions which were not always valid. They had their advocates as well as their critics. They gained as well as lost acceptance. The four theoretical orientations were: (1) the biological determinism theory, (2) the structural-environmental determinism theory, (3) the structural-environmental and cultural determinism theory, and (4) the cultural determinism theory.

The biological determinism theory was based on the "inherent mental inferiority of the Mexican American student." One of the first writers of this theoretical persuasion was Thomas Garth (1923) as he compared the intelligence of Mexican and Mixed and Full-Blood Indians. However, in a later study his results were in contradiction to his first findings. With the cooperation of Thomas H. Elson and Margaret M. Morton, Garth (1936) stated that perhaps it was the lack of English that could explain the low educational score and low I.Q. score rather than the "inherent mental inferiority."

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

Garth (1937) again with the help of Candor found no significant differences between the white population and the Mexican American population in pitch and rhythm. Carlson and Henderson (1950) attempted to control environmental variables to point out race differences. They were looking at (1) rural versus urban environment; (2) general socioeconomic level; (3) total cultural complex; (4) amount and quality of formal education on both subjects and parents; (5) effects of an inadequate diet; (6) prejudice on the part of the examiner; (7) motivation; and (8) bilingualism. The results of this study were highly questionable as a result of lack of control of motivation, bilingualism, rural-urban background, and English and Spanish vocabulary. One or a combination of these factors could account for the scores. The writers declined to comment on the native intellectual capacity of Mexican American children as contrasted to Anglo children until these factors and perhaps others were controlled. Thus these investigators appeared to focus on structural environmental factors for biological determinism reasons.

Critics of the biological determinism theory have felt not enough attention has been placed on the bilingual and economic factors in analyzing the Mexican American student. Because of the importance placed on these two factors a brief discussion will follow in an attempt to shed some light on the situation.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

According to the literature, there are two contradicting viewpoints on bilingualism and its effect on intelligence and school achievement. One viewpoint held by a large number of researchers was that bilingualism had a detrimental effect on intellectual functioning. On the other hand, a smaller number of researchers found little or no influence of bilingualism on intelligence and no significant difference between bilinguals and monolinguals on tests of intelligence was apparent (Peal and Lambert, 1962).

There are few well-controlled and methodological sound bilingual studies (Carter, 1970). One of the better studies was done by Arizona State University (1960). They found no significant relationship between intellectual performance and bilingualism, but significant relationships were found between sociocultural factors, school success, and test performance. Another well-controlled study (Peale and Lambert, 1962) revealed that bilinguals performed significantly better than monolinguals on both verbal and non-verbal intelligence tests. Many explanations were offered as reasons as to why bilinguals had this general intellectual advantage. It was pointed out that they had a language asset, were more facile at concept formation and had a greater mental flexibility. Carter (1970) pointed out that although current empirical evidence seems to argue against the idea that bilinguals have lower mental functioning, the majority of school people interviewed in his study subscribe to the idea. Therefore this writer's purpose

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

is not to suggest which studies are valid but to point out the different views which exist. For more information on Mexican American bilingualism see Colorado State Department of Education, 1967, W. R. Jones, "A Critical Study of Bilingualism and Non-Verbal Intelligence," 1960.

The socioeconomic level factor has been one of the most important if not the most important factor in explaining the low educational achievement of the Mexican American. Keyserling (1964) reported to the 1964 Economic Conference,

> Among both families and unattached individuals, there is a very high correlation (regardless of causation) between the amount of education and the amount of poverty. Out of 34 million U.S. poor, 52 percent reflected deficient education.

Poverty and minority are synonymous for a large segment of the Mexican American population (Galarza, 1969). About 2.1 million young persons 3 to 18 years old were living in households where the head reported Spanish as his mother tongue. About 17 percent of these children lived in households with a family income under $3,000, as compared with 8 percent in the total population. About 8 percent reported an income of $10,000 or more as compared to 35 percent of families whose mother tongue was English. (Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States, November, 1969). In proportion to their population, four times as many Anglos were found in professional and technical jobs as Mexican Americans (Glick, 1969). One third of the Mexican American men were engaged as laborers or farm workers compared to only 7 percent of Anglos. (Persons of

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

Spanish Surname, U. S. Census of Population, 1964). Of nearly 450,000 federal employees in the five southwest state area in 1964, 8 percent were Mexican American and they were concentrated in the lower-paying jobs (Report to the President, 1964). The same pattern prevailed in employment by federal contractors (Commission on Civil Rights, 1964). The state employment followed a similar course.

Several leaders of the Mexican American community offered as reasons for the seeming disinterest in government employment "a cultural aversion to having more contact with government than is necessary," a generally low level of education, language difficulties on written examinations, a lack of interest in office work of the women, and the belief, widely held among well-educated Mexican Americans, that they have a better chance in private than public employment (U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1964). "What might be added," according to Glick (1969) "was the reluctance of proud people to subject themselves to a possible rejection because of prejudice or discrimination." One Texas Congressman stated that "racial discrimination in job opportunities and wages is not unusual." But he added, "education is a substantial part of the problem." (Gonzalez, 1963). More recently, on June 5, 1970, four companies and 15 labor unions in Houston, Texas were charged with racial and sex discrimination (Report on Hearings of Discrimination in Employment, 1970). Commission Chairman, William H. Brown III and Commissioner Vicente T.

Xemines accused the companies and the unions of discriminating in recruiting, hiring, and upgrading of blacks, Mexican Americans, and women in violation of 1964 Civil Rights Act. Members of the Commission heard from some members of the Mexican American population. Gregory Salazar, member of the Mexican American Youth Organization stated that Mexican Americans and blacks were on the verge of turning to violence in Houston, which has been free of major riots. Salazar warned,

> If it takes violence, then that's what we'll use. That's an ugly word, but that's the way it is. We have been under this system 134 years. I would like to see that freedom and democracy we talk about one of these days.

Another member, Yolanda Birdwell, said, "We and our black brothers are getting tired of the companies telling us we are not qualified" (Report on Hearings of Discrimination in Employment, 1970).

Dr. Hector P. Garcia of Corpus Christi, founder of the G. I. Forum, told the Commission that without federal intervention in Texas, "I doubt that any progress would have been made by the blacks and Mexican Americans. Mexican Americans have been treated as a colonial group in Texas," he added (Report on Hearings of Discrimination in Employment, 1970).

Blacks and Mexican Americans each held only 2 percent of Houston's white collar jobs in 1966, although they make up respectively 25 percent and 7 percent of the population according to the latest count (New York Times, 1970).

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

Although a large percentage of Mexican Americans were found to be living in dismal economic conditions, not all of them fall into a single economical, educational, and social category. One of the major misconceptions when discussing Mexican Americans has been the attributing of characteristics to them which were really characteristics of people living in poverty. These characteristics were reflecting the lowest socioeconomic level and crossing ethnic lines (Casavantes, 1970). The following chart includes those qualities which have been invalidly attributed to Mexican Americans as part of their "ethnicity."

CHARACTEROLOGIC OR INTERPERSONAL STYLES:
Attributes of Most People Living in the Culture of Poverty

1. Their life within the context of an extended family incorporates a larger proportion of available time (than is true of middle and upper class individuals) in interaction with relatives and with other people living nearby.
2. They are non-joiners of voluntary associations, including fraternal, church-related, and political associations.
3. They have a preference for the old and the familiar, demonstrated by a reluctance to engage in new situations, or to form new social relationships, especially to initiate interactions with strangers.
4. They demonstrate a marked anti-intellectualism, which expresses itself in little admiration for intellectuals, professors, writers, artists, the ballet, symphonies, etc., as well as in lack of support for schools or for the school activities of their children.
5. Males demonstrate "machismo." This is seen as opposite behavior to being intellectual or engaging in such activities as the ballet. Males who demonstrate "machismo" brag a great deal about their male conquests, and refuse to engage in any behavior which

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

is associated with femininity, such as diaper-changing, dishwashing, cooking, etc.

6. There is a great deal of use of physical force, for example, to settle arguments or in the use of physical punishment with disobedient children.
7. They appear unable to postpone gratification. The tendency to live on a day-to-day basis looms extremely prevalent, and few provisions are made for long-range activities.
8. They are extremely fatalistic in their view of the world, feeling that they have very little control over nature, over institutions, or over events.

Adapted from: Cohen, Albert K., and Hodges, Harold M., Characteristics of the Lower-Blue-Collar Class, Winter, 1970.

Writers who accepted these attributes of poor people regardless of ethnicity questioned the validity of the theories which held that the Mexican American had educational problems because he was inferior or because of his culture. Mindiola (1970), a Mexican American University of Houston graduate student, charged Celia Heller in his master's thesis as describing the value system of a particular socioeconomic class and not the value system of the Mexican American subculture in Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. Poverty appeared to account for so many of the "problems" Mexican American children had in the classroom. There was more evidence in the literature to support the case that these "problems" were due to lack of economic resources and education and not because it was "in their blood."

The theoretical theme in opposition to biological determinism was the structural-environmental determinism which charged the economic and social structure of American society as the cause for the Mexican American educational problems. Structural-environmentalists took a long hard look at (1) the nature of the intelligence tests administered to Mexican American students; (2) the environmental influences which could retard their educational achievement and affect their I.Q. scores; (3) the educational policies and practices toward the education of the Mexican American children.

Some structural-environmental voices were angry coming from people in the government, the university, the community, and the church. The following voices illustrated this point. Armando Rodriguez, Chief, Office for Spanish Speaking Affairs, Office of the Secretary (1970), said:

> . . . testing has always been a serious educational roadblock for us. In the past, intelligence and achievement tests have produced _de facto_ ethnic segregation in the classroom. Spanish speaking children have often been categorized as 'slow' and mentally retarded because of low scores on tests that were unrelated to their cultural experience. . . . But tests are only indicators of something more essential: the basic attitude of the schools. The schools are culturally biased. They are designed to produce and serve students patterned after a one-culture-mold; at the same time they exclude those who do not fit the pattern.

One of the earliest advocates of this school of thought stated, "I have been working professionally in this field for more than forty years, and I have been critical or our schools' efforts for at least three-fourths of those years" (Sanchez, 1966). University of Texas professor Sanchez added,

> . . . Still I was amazed at the persistence of the assertation that bilingualism is bad, that a foreign, home-language is a handicap, that, somehow, children with Spanish as a mother tongue were doomed to failure--

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

> in fact that they were *ipso facto* less than normally intelligent.

Sanchez (1966) refused to accept the "language barrier" issue as the cause for the low achievement of the child. He cried,

> . . . to excuse the failure to do the usual job by accusing the Mexican American of virtually inherent fault reveals a professional blind spot so elementary that it is difficult not to question the professional competence and integrity of the educators responsible.

Another professor, Ballesteros (1970), exclaimed:

> Enough! There is no room for deprived, disadvantaged, and handicapped students in American education, regardless of color or ethnic background. It is an indictment against our school system. The Mexican American youth movement which has raised so eloquently the cry, *Ya Basta* is focusing its efforts on destroying the belief that the bilingual-bicultural person is 'disadvantaged.' Participants are striking at the long-held debilitating syndrome that the school can educate only those whose mold fits the curriculum. They are saying, if that is the extent of the schools' capacity, then truly the school is a disadvantaged situation.

A member of a Mexican American community was interviewed on his views of the schools (A Father in Texas, 1970). He said:

> I can't tell you much about the new principal but I can tell you a lot about the last one. He was very bad, a very bad man, I tell you. I do not understand how they make a man like that principal of a school, a place where there are children who go to learn.
>
> He was prejudiced, you see. And he let the teachers in that school be prejudiced to the students. When they got angry, they would call the children names, insult them. And the children--even very small children--were always punished very hard for little things. But he let the teachers get away with such things and when we complain, when the parents go to complain to him, nothing would happen. We would ask him how come he didn't call a meeting with these teachers and find out

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

> what their problems were and why did they feel this way about the Mexican? And so we would say to him, 'Why are these people working in this school if they don't like Mexican children? Why don't they go somewhere else?' But he would just make a long speech about other things to change the subject. That was his way with us, and he did nothing because he, too, disliked us. You do not have to have a lot of education, you know, to tell when you are hated.

Father Henry J. Casso (1970), speaking to a conference on Increasing Opportunities for Mexican American Students in Higher Education, remarked:

> Spontaneously the quest has been taken up, particularly by the youth. Mexican Americans are dealing with an educational institution that is geared to the exclusion of minorities yet in such a short time the minorities are already to become inclusive.

He also charges "that higher education does not yet have the tools, neither does it have the commitment nor the awareness to be able to shift into another gear."

Father Casso's message rang out clearly the structural-environmentalist's central theme. They saw a lack of awareness, commitment, and resources as they focused their attention on (1) the location and physical facilities of the schools, (2) the policies and practices, (3) the teachers, and (4) the curriculum.

There has been a relationship between the Southwest's historical fact of ethnic isolation and segregation of the Mexican American from the rest of its society and the location of Mexican American schools. Since schools were and still are a reflection of the society, many Mexican American children attended schools where they formed the ethnic majority.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

This concentration of Mexican American school population was most extreme in Texas. In a report to the President entitled *Report I: Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest*, it estimated that approximately 315,000 students, or nearly two-thirds of the Mexican American enrollment in this state, were located in twenty-seven counties along the Mexican border or a short distance from it. In this area, three of every five students were Mexican Americans compared to one of every five for the state as a whole (Mexican American Education Study, 1971).

While *de jure* (legal) segregation had been declared unconstitutional as cited in the landmark case of 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education (347.U.S.483), segregation based on educational purposes, housing patterns, and perhaps other reasons still existed.

In the *Brown Case* the Supreme Court held that the segregation by race of children in public schools was a deprivation of their basic right to education opportunity. The same charges were alleged by Mexican Americans as early as 1930 and as late as 1970. See *Independent School District* v. *Salvatierra* (Texas Civ. App. 33 S.W. 2nd 790, 1930); *Delgado* v. *The Bastrop Independent School District*, Civil Action No. 388 (W.D. Texas, June 15, 1948); and *Cisneros* v. *Corpus Christi Independent School District*, Civil Action No. 68-C-95, 1970.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

During the 30's and the 40's "Mexican Schools" were maintained on the grounds that separation was beneficial to Mexican American children (Carter, 1970). The assumptions on this educational decision were the lack of English, the need to be Americanized (adjusted) before mixing with Anglos, and slowness in school, which would hinder the progress of Anglos.

Wilson Little (1944) studied the segregation of Mexican Americans in 122 widely dispersed school districts of Texas. He found that 50 percent of these districts segregated Mexican Americans through the sixth grade or above and more than 17 percent (about one in six) separated them through the eighth grade or higher. In contrast, less than one district in ten segregated Mexican Americans only through the first two years. During this time educators felt that Mexican American children should be taught separately from the other children for the first two or three years because of language handicaps. Strickland and Sanchez (1948) found the same results. The continued isolation of Mexican American students after three years indicated that other prejudices, such as feelings that Mexican American children lacked personal cleanliness and had lower health standards, were probably the true reasons behind the segregation practice (Mexican American Education Study, 1971).

Other studies have found practices not often documented but often reported which gave reasons to question the segregation motive. These included: (1) the tendency for "Mexican schools" to have vastly inferior facilities, poorly

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

qualified teachers, and larger classes than Anglo schools; (2) the practice of placing all Spanish-surname children in segregated schools, even though some were fluent in English; (3) the fact that Negro children were sometimes assigned to "Mexican schools" suggests a racial rather than a language basis for segregation; (4) the lack of effort to enforce the often weak attendance laws; (5) the failure to demand enrollment and attendance of Mexican American children while counting them on the school census. This Texas practice was abolished when the state went on "average daily attendance" as a basis for financial support; (6) in numerous cases the discouraging of individual children from attending school at all, especially in the secondary-level institution (Carter, 1970). In September, 1971, the Houston Independent School district was boycotted by members of the Mexican American population because they were paired with blacks for integration purposes. For more information relating to practices in Mexican American schools, see Calderon, 1950; Ceja, 1957; Common Ground, Winter, 1947; Rubel, 1966; Strickland and Sanchez, 1948; Taylor, 1934; Trillingham and Hughes, 1943; and Carter, 1970.

Although conditions were somewhat improving, one still found schools with a high concentration of Mexican Americans to be in poor physical condition (Calderon, 1950; Corona, 1955). The State Board of Education gave a final warning of deficiencies and discontinued state accreditation as of July

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

1, 1972, to the West Oso Independent School District in Nueces County. (West Oso is located next to the Corpus Christi school district and is predominantly Mexican American). The accreditation team visited in 1965, 1966, 1968, and 1970 and found, among other things, facilities and buildings that were in poor condition. The report stated that rooms needed painting, numerous desks were in disrepair, and there was little or no storage space available to teachers in classrooms. The report added that in an elementary school, the playground was filled with dirt containing a large amount of oyster shell, constituting a possible safety hazard for children. (*Corpus Christi Caller Times*, Sunday, September 12, 1971). In many Texas school districts there is a great difference between the physical facilities of predominantly minority schools and white middle-class institutions. A new practice in some school districts was to replace these older plants with new modern schools. This explains why a few *barrio* schools had by far the best facilities in the district. If this trend continues, the difference in quality might be reduced.

Part of this inequity was found in the states' ability and desire to support their school districts. The following table presents the financial effort and the results of that effort in five Southwestern states. Although no clear cut conclusion was drawn from this data, certain differences were apparent. For example, California was seen as spending the most money, paying the highest salary, having the fewest dropouts,

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

and is second only to Colorado in lowest percentage of draft rejectees. Texas, on the other hand, was shown as having the poorest school attendance, lowest teacher salary, lowest expenditures per pupil, and being in the middle range in number of dropouts and has the next to the highest percentage failing mental tests for the draft (Carter, 1970).

Table 10*

Selected Statistics on School Attendance, Graduation, and Expenditures Per State in Five Southwestern States, 1965-66

Average Percentage of Children Ages 5-17 Attending School Daily

State	Rank order among all states	Percent
California	5	93.8
Colorado	6	92.0
Arizona	21	84.7
New Mexico	22	84.6
Texas	24	83.3

Number of Children (Ages 5-17) Per 100 Adults (Ages 21-64)

State	Rank order among all states	Number of children
New Mexico	1	69
Arizona	12	58
Colorado	18	56
Texas	18	56
California	43	49

*Table 10 as numbered in original source. See source footnote, page 23.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

Estimated Expenditure Per ADA (Average Daily Attendance Unit)

State	Rank order among all states	Expenditure
California	9	$613
Colorado	22	571
Arizona	23	568
New Mexico	24	556
Texas	39	449

Public School Expenditure as Percent of Personal Income, 1965

State	Rank order among all states	Percent of personal income
New Mexico	2	5.4
Arizona	5	5.0
Colorado	10	4.6
Texas	24	4.0
California	32	3.8

Pupils Per Classroom Teacher

State	Rank order among all states	Pupils
Colorado	12	22.3
Arizona	22	23.8
New Mexico	26	24.4
Texas	31	24.9
California	44	26.7

Estimated Average Teachers' Salaries

State	Rank order among all states	Salary
California	2	$8,450
Arizona	15	7,320
New Mexico	20	6,630
Colorado	21	6,625
Texas	33	6,025

Public High School Graduates in 1964-65, as Percent of Ninth-Grade Class in 1961-62

State	Rank order among all states	Percent of ninth-grade class
California	1	88.9
Colorado	20	78.2
Texas	34	69.5
New Mexico	38	68.0
Arizona	47	62.6

Percent of Draftees Failing Mental Tests, 1965

State	Rank order among all states	Percent
Colorado	20	14.0
California	25	15.3
Arizona	26	20.5
Texas	35	23.3
New Mexico	38	25.4

Source: National Education Association (1967, pp. 12, 21, 25, 29, 32, 54).

The state's and the local community's desire to support and enrich the school district was seen just as important as the ability to finance it. Carter in his book Mexican Americans in Schools: A History of Educational Neglect, (1970), discussed the poor facilities in Mexican American schools with a Texas school administrator. The administrator commented that it was the feeling of some of his colleagues to provide inferior facilities arguing that placing such children in beautiful schools with exciting surroundings would raise their expectations and ultimately encourage frustration, since "few

Mexicans can ever reach such levels during their lifetime." Although new modern school plants do not guarantee quality education, it was difficult to argue that new exciting classrooms do not influence the quality of education.

Some school policies and practices actually prevented Mexican American children from succeeding said the structural environmentalists. Although there was little empirical data to reach clear cut conclusions, critics made strong points against some of the school policies and practices. For example, the "No Speaking Spanish rule" has been inferred by Mexican Americans as a denial of their home and culture, according to the current literature. This tended to lead the child's thinking his mother tongue was "inferior." This thinking was reinforced again by having all instruction with a few exceptions in English. Punishment for speaking Spanish in schools has left many psychological scars throughout the Southwest. A Mexican American principal in California remembered when his teacher would punish him for speaking Spanish in the classroom and his friends would hit him for speaking English on the playground so he wouldn't forget his Mexican heritage. The "No Spanish rule" was abolished in some school districts and in others "English was encouraged." These rules were based on assumptions that were not always valid. Here are some of the assumptions according to the selected literature: (1) English is the national language and must be learned; the best way to learn it is to prohibit Spanish; (2) bilingualism

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

is mentally confusing; (3) the Spanish spoken in the Southwest is a sub-standard dialect; (4) teachers don't understand Spanish. Some of the most common complaints from the Anglo staff are: "I don't know what they are talking about. It is not polite to speak a foreign tongue in front of a person who doesn't speak it." These statements were seriously questioned by critics (Carter, 1970). Were teachers and administrators so insecure in their relationship that they thought the Mexican American students were talking and plotting against them? Perhaps it was just the threat element to authority by not knowing the "communication code" of the subordinate.

Another practice found especially in lower socioeconomic elementary and junior high schools is the rigid dress code. Until recently it was only the Mexican Americans who were punished for their hair style, mustache, and general appearance (Rubel, 1966). Cultural anthropologists told us each culture or subculture dictated what was "proper" for a person to wear. In certain parts of the barrio long hair, shirts worn on the outside with more than the collar button open, was the style. Many Mexican American students were suspended for violating the dress code. Rubel quotes an administrator, "Each Mexican American child is screened before he is permitted to enroll, and if he wants to stay, he has to get a good haircut, cut off the sideburns (emphasis mine) (1966).

Another common practice which negated a child's Mexican heritage was changing or "Anglicizing" his name.. Personality theorists have stated that a child's name is perhaps "the foundation of self-identity." Yet some schools change the Spanish given names to English because (1) it is more convenient for the Anglo teachers, (2) teachers like Anglo names better, (3) this is the United States. Consequently *Pedro* is changed to Pete, *Jose* is changed to Joe and *Maria* to Mary. The Spanish name that really upsets the schools is *Jesus*. That name "has to be changed" to Jesse (Carter, 1970). After all, what good white Anglo Saxon Protestant teacher is going to say, "Jesus, you have to stay after school for speaking Spanish"! In some instances the names were changed by the students themselves in order to be "accepted" by the parent society. At the present time there is a trend among some Mexican Americans, especially the youth group, to keep and use their Spanish names as a matter of self identity and self pride.

Another common practice found in Texas was the assignment of Mexican American teachers in predominantly Mexican American schools. The arguments for this judgment rested on assumptions which were not always valid. These assumptions were that the teacher would be seen as a model and his ability and insight in the Mexican American culture would allow him to work more effectively with the students. Having a Mexican American teacher will not guarantee success in teaching Mexican American students. This interview with a lawyer in Texas will illustrate this point.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

> Some people think the answer is more Chicanos (Mexican Americans) on the school board, more Chicano teachers, more Chicanos here, more Chicanos there. But what happens? The Anglos still wind up running things. They find teachers who have come up through the Anglo system, who have been taught to believe that it is bad to be Mexican, and it is these people that they put in the classroom. And then they say, 'Here, look, we have Chicanos teaching in our schools!' But what have they really got? They just have more Anglos--not by birth, you understand, but by attitude. But the Anglo superintendent or principal feels good. He has somebody in the classroom actually teaching, whose name is Gonzales or Ramirez. It makes him look very liberal, and he can go on running things the same old way and feel good about it.

The Colorado Commission on Spanish-Surnamed Citizens, stated "Mexican American teachers. . . from upper-middle-class-urban culture many have nothing in common with a poor working class Spanish-curnamed student" (1966).

Another characteristic of schools with a heavy Mexican American enrollment was a large percentage of poorly trained teachers. The Governor's Committee on Public School Education in Texas (1968) found a strong relationship between Spanish-surname percentages in the population and teachers who were teaching with less than a bachelor's degree. In 1966 Ramirez reported that 10 percent of the teachers had no bachelor's degree, 13 percent were teaching on emergency credentials, and 30 percent were on provisional credentials; only 57 percent of 1,650 elementary teachers in the lower Rio Grande Valley were fully certified Texas teachers.

While there is a great need for bilingual teachers, they don't all have to be Mexican Americans. Blacks, Anglos, and Mexican Americans appeared to be equally effective

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

teaching Mexican American students. These teachers, regardless of color or ethnicity, should have the professional knowledge, skill, and adaptability to understand and accept and teach "*every* child whatever his background is, whatever his language is, whatever his abilities are, to his fullest capabilities" (Howe, 1966).

The curriculum of schools with a heavy concentration of Mexican Americans was seen to be of a negative nature, based on the criteria to place students in tracks or sequences and the tendency to keep them there. No one would argue the fact that there are individual differences even within the Mexican American population. Tracking was a common device used to treat the students differently. Tracking was generally based on achievement and intelligence tests, counselor's observations, behavior records, teacher recommendations, and parents' request. However, the principle factor for selection was the intelligence and achievement scores (Carter, 1970). To no one's surprise the relationship between socioeconomic level and tracking was obvious. Hickerson (1962) and Parsons (1965) found Mexican American children in disproportionately high percentages in vocational and low ability tracks. One of the strongest criticisms of tracking was that it is almost impossible to move upward from a track due to the inflexibility of the school program. However, it appeared to be easier to make progress in the elementary schools than in junior and senior high schools.

Most educators argued for ability tracking on the grounds that it eliminated extreme abilities, and the curriculum could better be adjusted to "meet the needs" of students as a group and as individuals. On the other hand, others argued against it on the basis that it had ill effects on attitudes, aspirations, and self concepts of the students.

Although no studies on the effects of tracking on Mexican American students were found during this writing, studies on the effects of homogeneous grouping have been generally inconclusive. After surveying the literature relative to the effects of tracking, Goldberg, Passow, and Justin (1966) stated,

> Many of the issues concerning grouping (tracking) remain unresolved, and most questions are still unanswered despite 70 or 80 years of practice and at least 40 years of study. Insufficient and conflicting data are being used to support partisan views concerning the consequences of grouping, rather than to resolve the persistence issues.

Then in their own study of elementary tracking in New York City, they concluded:

> . . . in predominantly middle-class elementary schools, narrowing the ability range in the classroom on the basis of some measure of general academic aptitude will, by itself, in the absence of carefully planned adaptations of content and methods, produce little positive change in the academic achievement of pupils at any ability level. However, the study found no support for the contention that narrow range classes are associated with negative effects on self-concept, aspirations, interests, attitudes toward school, and other non-intellectual factors.

They concluded that tracking was in itself neither good nor bad:

> Grouping can be at best, ineffective; at worst, harmful. It can become harmful when it lulls teachers and parents into believing that because there is grouping, the school is providing differentiated education for pupils of varying degrees of ability, when in reality that is not the case. It may become damaging when it is inflexible and does not provide channels for moving children from lower to higher ability groups and back again.

Samora (1963) said this about tracking:

> Many communities have had their 'Mexican rooms' for years and years. This is segregation on pseudo-pedological grounds, the reasoning behind being that children who come to school who are Spanish-speaking should be placed in a room by themselves in order to learn English. One community in Colorado had such segregation through the first four grades as late as 1950. A neighboring community in southern Colorado just abandoned their 'Mexican rooms' last year after pressure was brought about by the local Spanish citizenry.

Studies supporting the structural-environmental orientation were found as early as 1936 and as recently as 1971. Guy A. West (1936) found an extensive area in the Southwestern states in which a large percent of the population is of Spanish extraction and, although some degree of assimilation and intermarriage had taken place, there still prevailed, throughout this region, considerable racial prejudice. The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not attitudes of prejudice existed among the teachers in the public schools and whether Mexican American teachers displayed racial attitudes differing from those of Anglo teachers. West (1936) found Anglo teachers "more strongly inclined than the Mexican Americans to claim superiority for pupils of their own race." Sanchez (1940) in his book Forgotten People remarked, "The unresponsiveness of the school to the environment of New Mexican children tends to force them out of school." Another advocate of this theoretical scheme was Paul Taylor who found the relationship between the economic system of American industry and the migratory patterns and conditions of Mexican American migrant workers were in accordance with the earlier works of Adams (1936), Landis (1936), and Tetreau (1940). Pasamanich (1951) argued more focus should be paid to structural variables in the analysis of the intelligence of the Mexican American child. Morton Keston and Carmina Jimenez (1954) did just that when they set up their study "to determine whether the bilingual children of Albuquerque, New Mexico, should be given the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test in a translated Spanish version or in the original English form." They compared the intelligence scores of these children in the one language with their intelligence test scores in the other language. The results were that the children scored higher on the English version than they did on the Spanish version. Staying away from the biological determinism theory the researchers stated that the probable reasons were (1) even though Mexican Americans speak Spanish, their formal training in Spanish was far inferior to their formal training in English. This point was supported earlier by Manakian (1939) who found English became the dominant language of Mexican Americans from the fifth grade on. Since they received no formal training in Spanish before the fifth

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LIBRARIES

grade, English was their only formally learned language. The high correlation between English test scores and grade point average, as opposed to a low correlation between Spanish scores and grade point average, added support to Keston's and Jimenez's explanation. Other studies were: Ed D. Tetrarau and Emory Bogardus (1940); Norman Humphrey (1941); Charles Loomis (1943), (1943), (1944), and (1945). One of the latest studies was reported in the Houston Chronicle on September 4, 1971. Dr. George W. Mayeske of the U.S. Office of Education and Dr. Jane R. Mercer of the University of California at Riverside conducted a study in 1971 of nearly 124,000 grade school pupils and found white and minority-group youngsters scored almost identically on school achievement tests when environmental and social factors were statistically cancelled. Dr. Mercer added that I.Q. scores of average Mexican American and Negro pupils were essentially the same as for white pupils when social and cultural disadvantages were taken into account. Dr. Mercer stated:

> Although genetic factors undoubtedly produce differences in ability within the various ethnic groups, the difference between the coverage test scores of black and Chicano students and the scores of Anglo middle-class students can be accounted for by environmental factors.

The third theoretical theme was the combination of the structural-environmental and cultural-determinism theories. These theorists blamed the economics, the language, the school, and the cultural conflict between the Mexican American

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

and the Anglo society for the poor educational progress of the Mexican American students. The blending of the two theories in a complementary nature was not always successful. Sometimes they even contradicted each other in the same works.

Paul Walters (1939) was one of the early writers taking this viewpoint. He investigated the problems of rural oriented New Mexicans encountered in an industrialized society. He stated such values as fatalism, dependency and traditionalism stifled their progress. On the other hand he offered some evidence which contradicted his first premise. For example, he commented on the cities' irrigation project for improvement which indicated they didn't lack in initiative and self reliance (Vaca, 1970). The dry farming attempt by some villagers to increase their income was an indication of not being tied to traditional methods and a willingness to change.

Emory S. Bogardus (1943) used this theoretical framework to explain the behavior of the Mexican American gang. He said the behavior was due to:

> (1) unemployment as a result of the Mexican American indifference toward work, (2) low intelligence quotients, due to inbreeding (they were born subnormal), (3) boys growing up in culturally underprivileged neighborhoods where they lacked the same type of recreation that others had, (4) finding themselves discriminated against occupationally.

Two other works appeared in later literature which utilized this theory. One was Dr. Jack D. Forbes' Mexican Americans: A Handbook for Educators (1966). He blames the Mexican American parents and the schools. Forbes remarked,

> Unfortunately, many younger Mexican Americans educated in Anglo-oriented schools have not been able to relate in a positive manner toward the north Mexican or Mexican Anglo mixed cultures primarily because their parents have been unable to effectively transmit the Spanish language and Mexican heritage to them.

He charged the schools with "attacking or completely ignoring that heritage." Forbes added that students subjected to this type of pressure have not ordinarily become Anglos though because of a feeling of being rejected by the dominant society (because of frequently experienced prejudices and discrimination) and by the schools (because the curriculum is so totally negative as regards their own personal and cultural background). He concluded that these students have often created a mixed Anglo-Mexican subculture built around a language incorporating English and Spanish words and a "gang" style of organization.

In 1970, Dr. Dell Felder used this structural-environmental and cultural-determinism theory in her article, "The Education of Mexican Americans: Fallacies of the Monoculture Approach." In the beginning of her article she used the cultural determinism frame of reference to contrast the Anglo and Mexican American values. Dr. Felder stated,

> In contrast to the importance Anglos assign to progress and change, the Spanish-speaking value tradition. While the social roles of Anglos reflect the egalitarian principle, the social relationships of Mexican Americans express the values of familism and paternalism. Anglos believe they can control the future; they strive to manipulate the environment to suit their needs. The Mexican American is more likely to be fatalistic, disposed to believe that altering the present will have little effect on the future.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LIBRARIES

She added,

> . . . Children socialized in the Spanish-speaking culture, therefore, internalize disposition toward social relationships, success, efficiency, goal orientation, and time which often conflict with the values of the American school.

Later in the same article she switched from the cultural-determinism view to the structural-environmental position. She stated

> . . . Add to this the fact that most of these children come from economically deprived homes. Then imagine the difficulties faced by a Mexican American child, who must relate to an instructional program presented in a language other than his own.

Finally in her suggestions for curricula reform she combined both theories by stating, "A second important step would be to recognize that *economic deprivation* and *cultural differences* generate serious handicaps to learning" (emphasis mine).

The fourth theoretical paradigm was cultural determinism. This theory held the Mexican American culture responsible for the students' failure in school. Cultural determinism rested on three assumptions. The first assumption was the basis of Mexican American culture revolving around "values," value orientation or value systems. The second assumption was that Mexican American values were the opposite of Anglo values. Finally the third was the Mexican American values were not only the opposite of Anglo values but were in conflict with the schools' expectations resulting in academic failure.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

Cultural determinism appeared in the 1930's and at present holds the dominant position over the other theories according to the current literature (Vaca, 1970). In 1938, Loaz Johnson produced a study disclosing the Mexican American educational failure. This study was important because it came at the time biological determinism was dying out and there were few advocates for structural environmental determinism. Johnson pointed out that the Mexican American was of a different race, therefore his motives, his tendencies, his philosophy of life, and his customs were very different from those of Anglo Americans. She added that since he used a different language in his life, his idioms of thought must necessarily be different (Johnson, 1938).

In 1943, Norman D. Humphrey was the first writer to discuss the Mexican American culture in terms of "values." In his work, "The Concept of Culture in Social Case Work," he stated, "Each ethnic group was created, or has utilized, specific symbols; has assigned meanings to distinct objects in the environment." Then Humphrey evolved from "symbols" to "norms" and later inserted values for norms. Humphrey's work rested on two assumptions that have not been empirically proven. One is that there do exist different values and that the Anglo values are superior to those of the Mexican American. Later, Humphrey changes from the value orientation concept to behavioral patterns using language and family structure as an index to measure the degree of assimilation of Mexican American families into the "American way of life."

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

David Senter (1945) also held the behavioral pattern viewpoint rather than a Mexican American culture made up of "values." He pointed out that minority groups faced three possibilities of adjustment:

> (1) They may attempt to maintain their original culture, (2) they may attempt quick acceptance of the new culture, the situation leading to eventual assimilation, although the path will be roughened by prejudice, (3) they may develop something foreign to both their ancestral culture and that of the present majority group.

In 1946 he reaffirmed his position with the cooperation of Florence Hawley focusing on parental roles, customs on dating, and patterns of behavior to instruction in the Mexican American family.

But it was in the middle 1940's and the early 1950's when cultural determinism promoted the notion of Mexican American culture composed of values. During World War II many Mexican Americans were found functionally illiterate and were placed in special educational centers. The Mexican American cultural baggage was given for not meeting Army standards (Altus, 1943).

Sister Frances Jerome Woods (1949) studied Mexican American leadership in San Antonio basing it on cultural differences adding paternalism, courtesy, and a "general lack of value for money." In the same year, Louis F. Harvey (1949) used the same theoretical scheme to explain the behavior of "The Delinquent Mexican Boy."

During the 1950's, Florence K. Kluckhohn really clinched it for the value orientation advocates as she wrote articles in 1950, 1951, and 1953 based on her doctoral thesis, "Value Orientations of Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans."

Watson and Samora (1954) were attracted to the value orientation scheme and used it as they studied leadership in a Mexican American community. In the same year Lyle Saunders published his book Cultural Differences and Medical Care. He based his work on Florence Kluckohn's dissertation thesis of 1937. Saunders placed Mexican American "values" opposite Anglo American values. He stated on time: "Unlike the Anglo, the Spanish American or Mexican American is likely to be strongly oriented toward the present or the immediate past." On change: "There is probably nothing the Anglo more completely accepts than the notion that change is good and progress inevitable. . . The Spanish-speaking person coming from another background has a somewhat different orientation toward change and progress." On acceptance and resignation: "The Spanish-speaking people have a somewhat greater readiness toward acceptance and resignation than is characteristic of the Anglo."

By the late 1950's the notion of the Mexican American based on value orientation was well accepted. The following writings during this period will illustrate this point: Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups, by Woods, 1956; "Variations of Selected Cultural Patterns Among Three

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

Generations of Mexican Americans in San Antonio, Texas," by Francesca, 1958; *Health in the Mexican American Culture*, by Clark, 1959.

The trend followed into the 1960's. Horacio Ulibarri (1960) wrote that the American school was based on middle class values in "Teacher Awareness of Sociocultural Differences in Multicultural Classrooms." Again Julian Samora (1961) discussed the Mexican American culture in terms of value orientation in "Conceptions of Health and Disease Among Spanish Americans." Then in the same year Florence Rockwood Kluckhohn with the help of Fred Strodtbeck emphasized the value orientation people again. Their most basic assumption "was that there was a *systematic variation* in the realm of cultural phenomena, which is both as definite and as essential as the demonstrated systematic variations in physical and biological phenomena." Their book, *Variations in Value Orientations*, made such an impact in the field that the majority of the writers in Mexican American culture used it as a basis and a springboard. This work even changed the mind of Herschel T. Manuel from structural-environmentalist to a cultural determinist as illustrated in his book, *Spanish Speaking Children of the Southwest* (1965). Perhaps no other work has rested so heavily on the cultural deterministic theme as Cecilia Heller's *Mexican American Youth at the Crossroad*. Heller strongly suggested that the Mexican American cultural set of values must be replaced by Anglo set of

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

values if he is to be successful. But then again Heller made some assumptions which were questioned by Mindiola, Vaca, Romano, and others.

For more information on the Mexican American as seen from the cultural deterministic viewpoint see Clark Knowlton, 1962; William Madsen, 1964; Louis Zurcher, 1965; Fernando Penalosa and Edward McDonagh, 1966; Louis Hernandez, 1969; John W. Moore and Alfredo Cuellar, 1970; and Thomas P. Carter, 1970.

The reason for selecting the Mexican American cultural characteristics in the cultural deterministic scheme is three-fold: (1) It is fair to say that the reigning theoretical paradigm for the analysis of the Mexican American is that of cultural determinism based on a definition of Mexican American culture as composed of values detrimental to success in the American way of life (Vaca, 1970). Many of the works based on this theoretical theme are used in graduate and professional schools throughout the nation to explain the Mexican American way of life. (2) These characteristics appear more often in the field. (3) According to the selected literature, these characteristics seemed to handicap the educational progress of the Mexican American child.

Here are the selected Mexican American cultural characteristics:

1. *Ethnic Isolation*. Mexican Americans tended to live together in one section of town called *barrios* or

colonias. According to Kibbe (1946) this section was often set apart by a railroad track, a highway, or a river. A colonia was defined by Burma (1954) as a "satellite community, separated from the parent community by psychic and social isolation." Generally they would occupy buildings in the older and neglected parts of town, where rent and ownership costs were low and community services and facilities were at a minimum (Saunders, 1954).

2. Spanish Language. The hodge podge language which the child brings to school is a dialect of American Spanish incorporating thousands of words of English origin. This language is sometimes referred to as Tex-Mex or pocho. Some social scientists and educators stated that Spanish interfered with the correct speaking of English. Not only were there differences in sounds but also in concepts between the two languages. The language problem was seen as a serious one by Madsen (Madsen, 1964). A recent survey revealed Mexican Americans knew some English but used it infrequently (NEA, Tuscon Survey Group, 1966). Up until the late 1940's Mexican American children were in separate buildings of schools based on the rationale that these children knew little or no English upon entering school.

3. Fatalism. The concept that man is the helpless object to whom the things happen, rather than the master of his fate with an active part in his own destiny. According to Madsen, the Mexican American believed that his destiny

was predetermined. For this reason the Mexican American tended to meet difficulties by adjusting to them rather than by attempting to overcome them (Saunders, 1954). Fatalism manifested itself in many ways (Edmondson, 1957). The Mexican American felt that he was "subjugated to nature" rather than being master over nature (Kluckhohn, 1961).

4. Present Day Orientation. Since most Mexican Americans belong to the lower socioeconomic levels of American society, their orientation has been focused on the present rather than the future. Lacking future orientation for planning ahead, (Madsen, 1964), the Mexican American preferred a present alternative to future alternatives (Kluckhohn, 1961). Because he felt that the present could not be ignored (Saunders, 1954), the Mexican American would be considered presumptious to plan for tomorrow (Madsen, 1964).

5. Limited Aspirations. Few Mexican American parents encouraged higher education or intellectual efforts in their homes (Heller, 1966). An "educated" person in a Spanish-speaking home was one who had been well trained as a social being. An informal education within the family was regarded as more important than formal schooling. Because achievement was not stressed in the Mexican American home, Heller saw this lack of emphasis upon "making good" in conventional terms as being consistent with the themes of fatalism and resignation that ran through the Mexican American culture.

6. Machismo. The ideal male role was manifested by the concept of machismo or "manliness." The man was conceived as having "superior" strength and intelligence which placed him above criticism (Madsen, 1964). Demonstrating his sexual prowess by seeking extramarital affairs was viewed as an affirmation of his manliness and this was also a means of winning him prestige among his male acquaintances (Madsen, 1964; Edmonson, 1957). Also, maintaining a mistress in a second household known as the casa chica was the most convincing way of proving his machismo and financial ability (Madsen, 1964).

7. Family Solidarity. The family was seen as the major focus of social identity with certain roles and expectations (Madsen, 1964). Persons were first identified as a member of a family than as an individual. Authority rests with the father, ruler and decision maker of the household. The mother's role of making a home for the husband and children was regarded as subordinate and restricted.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

Chapter 2

THE DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

DEVELOPMENT

Format

The instruments were developed by this writer. (See Appendix). There were two schedules designed for the study; one was for the students and one for the parents. The one for the parents was translated into Spanish for persons who did not speak or understand English. Some of the questionnaire items were modifications from previous studies done in Mexican American communities (Carter, 1970; Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, 1970; Kluckhohn, 1963; Manual, 1965; and Rivera, 1968). The rest of the items were specifically developed for this study by this writer.

The questions were arranged logically to avoid confusion and misunderstanding (Parten, 1950). Transitional statements were made between the different categorical questions so the respondent could grasp a change of subject matter and not interpret and react to in the light of earlier questions. The usual precautionary method of alternating the position of the responses was utilized in an effort to avoid a response pattern.

The questionnaires were divided into seven categories as follows: (1) Ethnic Isolation, (2) Spanish Language, (3) Fatalism, (4) Present Day Orientation, (5) Limited Aspiration, (6) Machismo, and (7) Family Solidarity. The students' schedule contained eighty-three questions while the parents' English and Spanish questionnaires had seventy-eight questions.

Questions which yielded information on Ethnic Isolation were 1 through 14 on the students' and parents' schedules.

Example:

Do you think there is any chance of your moving in the next 12 months?
a. Yes _____
b. No _____

Items 15 through 39 on the students' questionnaire and items 15 through 35 on the parents' questionnaire obtained information relating to the Spanish language.

Example:

What language do you speak in your home?
a. _____ Mostly Spanish
b. _____ Mostly English
c. _____ Only Spanish
d. _____ Only English
e. _____ Both

Items relating to Fatalism were 40 through 51 on the students' questionnaire and items 36 through 44 on the parents' questionnaire.

Example:

Everytime I try to get ahead something or someone stops me.
a. _____ agree
b. _____ disagree

Present Day information was obtained from questions 56 through 59 on the students' schedule and questions 49 through 52 on the parents' schedule.

Example:

a. Some people believe it best to give most attention to what is happening now in the present. They say that the past has gone and the future is much too uncertain to count on.
b. Some people think that the ways of the past were the most right and the best, and as changes come things get worse.
c. Some people believe that it is the ways of the future which will be best, and they say that although there are sometime disappointments, change brings improvements in the long run.

Which one of these ways of looking at life do you think is best?
a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

Limited Aspiration questions included 60 through 69 on the students' questionnaire and 53 through 64 on the parents' questionnaire.

Student Example:

What do you think you should do about school?
a. ______ drop out and get a job
b. ______ finish high school
c. ______ finish high school and get a job
d. ______ go to college
e. ______ finish college and get a job

Parent Example:

What do you think your son (daughter) should do about school?
a. ______ drop out and get a job
b. ______ finish high school
c. ______ finish high school and get a job
d. ______ go to college
e. ______ finish college and get a job

Items 41, 52, 54, 66, 67 and 71 through 84 obtained information on the Machismo concept on the students' questionnaire. Questions 45, 46, 47, 61, 62 and 65 through 78 on the parents' questionnaire yielded information on Machismo.

Example:

Men are always smarter than women.
a. _____ agree
b. _____ disagree

Family Solidarity was covered by questions 41, 55, 66, 67, and questions 71 through 84 on the students' schedule. On the parents' schedule Family Solidarity questions included 48, 65, and 66 through 78.

Example:

Your family is more important than you.
a. _____ agree
b. _____ disagree

Validity

Helmstadter argued that the most common variety of content validity (or any type of validity, for that matter) is face validity. Face validity refers not to what a test actually measures, but to what it appears, on the basis of a subjective evaluation, to measure (Helmstadter, 1964). The evaluation of both questionnaires was made by a five-member panel of experts who have done work in the field of Mexican American education. These educators have served as local, state, and national consultants in the field of educating the Mexican American student. The five members were as

follows: (1) Mr. Alonso Perales, Curriculum Director, San Antonio Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas; (2) Mr. Gonzalo Garza, Area V Superintendent, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas; (3) Mr. Carlos Rivera, Assistant Superintendent for Mexican American Education, El Paso Independent School District, El Paso, Texas; (4) Mr. Salvador Alvarez, Foreign Language Consultant, Corpus Christi Independent School District, Corpus Christi, Texas, and (5) Dr. Josephine Sobrino, Professor, Spanish Department, University of Houston, Houston, Texas. Dr. Sobrino and Mr. Alvarez assisted in translating the questionnaire into Spanish so the persons in the barrios would have a better understanding of the instrument.

Reliability

The instruments were tested for reliability using the test-retest method (Helmstadter, 1964). The questionnaires were administered to 30 Edison Junior High ninth graders and 60 parents in the Magnolia area in Houston, Texas. Magnolia was selected because it was very similar to the Zavala area in Corpus Christi. The Houston area was predominantly Mexican American, had well-defined boundaries and considered low socioeconomically (Rivera, 1968).

ADMINISTRATION

Informants

The use of local bilingual interviewers became of vital importance while doing research in the Mexican American barrios. First there was the language factor. Second there was the inherited suspicion of outsiders. Interviewers from the barrios established rapport quicker and gained the confidence of the respondent which was needed for an effective study. Using marginal informants was in agreement with other studies (Pearl and Riesman, 1965; Rivera, 1968).

Although there were some social scientists who questioned the utilization of lay persons for interviewing, others like Pearl (1965) argued that the poor can interview the poor more effectively. He claimed that the interviewer who was "only one step removed" from the client will improve the giving of service as well as provide useful and meaningful employment for barrio residents.

Sample Area

Corpus Christi with a population of 201,548 was chosen as the site for the study (1970 Advanced Census Report). Mexican Americans made up approximately 49 percent of the total population. According to the Bureau of Business Research at the University of Texas the city listed eight major industries: (1) Agriculture, (2) Fishing, (3) Manufacturing, (4) U. S. Naval Air Station and Army Maintenance Center,

(5) Oil, (6) Port, (7) Ranching, and (8) Tourism. The educational system consisted of one senior (4 year) college, two junior (2 year) colleges, five senior high schools, 12 junior high schools, and 42 elementary schools. At the time of this writing the State Coordinating Board approved an upper level college in Corpus Christi to be administered by Texas A and I University at Kingsville.

There were several reasons for selecting the Zavala neighborhood area for the study. First, it has been one of the oldest Mexican American neighborhoods in Corpus Christi. Second, it had well-defined boundaries which included Highway 44 and three major streets (Port, Baldwin, and Morgan). Third, it was primarily a residential area located in the west part of town. This section of town has had much crime. . . (murders, narcotics, burglars, and vice). Fourth, the area is relatively isolated from downtown, major suburbs, and the greater community. Fifth, the median educational level for persons 25 years and over was reported at the 3.7 grade on the 1960 census. (The 1970 figures for this area were not available at the time of this writing). It was interesting to note that the Zavala Neighborhood Council in light of their low educational achievement listed a four-year state supported college as one of their top priorities for the 1970's, second only to more jobs for their teenagers. Sixth, this area has been defined by the local OEO Community Action office and by the school district as a low socioeconomic area with a median income of $3,031 per family (1960 Census).

The Zavala neighborhood had very few recreational facilities. Meadow Park recreational center and Ella Barnes swimming pool were the focus of much activity due to lack of facilities around the barrio.

While Zavala was predominantly a residential area there were many Mexican American and other small businesses which served the community, e.g., small grocery stores, a tortilla factory, a newspaper printed in Spanish, Mexican cafes, Mexican bakeries, and several bars.

Procedure

Most of the reasons for using sampling procedures rather than making complete enumerations of the population in a survey have been well known and generally accepted (Parten, 1950). One hundred Mexican American ninth graders were randomly selected from over two hundred Ella Barnes junior high school Mexican American students. The reason for choosing ninth graders was these students were approaching the age of seventeen, the legal age for dropping out of school. Several Mexican American students reached their seventeenth birthday in the ninth grade because they had been retained for one or more years. In hardship cases where there is little income in a family. fifteen and sixteen-year-old students have been known to get work permits and drop out of school (Arias, 1971). This writer administered the questionnaire to the students.

Each selected student was given two letters, one in English and the other in Spanish (see appendix) explaining the study to the parents.

The parents of the selected students were interviewed by four 2-member teams; one interviewer asked questions while the other recorded responses.

Prerequisite to the training of good investigators was the hiring of promising candidates. Eleventh and twelfth grade Mexican American students were hired after being recommended by teachers, Neighborhood Job Corps coordinator, counselors, and principal, and being interviewed by this writer.

A workshop was conducted for the investigators by this writer and two members of the Corpus Christi School District, Mr. Herbert Garcia, Neighborhood Job Corps Supervisor and Mr. Albert Villarreal, Title VII Bilingual Director. These persons were chosen to help in the orientation because they were bilingual and had worked for several years in the Zavala neighborhood area. Topics which were covered in the workshop were as follows: (1) Purpose of the study, (2) Location of the respondents, (3) When to call, (4) How to approach, (5) How to close, and (6) Demonstration interviews. The demonstration interviews were conducted in English and Spanish.

A boy-girl team was chosen over a two-boy team or a two-girl team after the pre-test interviews. It was the feeling of this writer that a girl-boy team was not only a precautionary method but that some men were reluctant to be interviewed by young women. The women did not seem to mind being interviewed by either young men or young women.

Time for each interview varied from 45 minutes to one hour. A total of seventy six schedules were administered. The rest of the parents appeared to be suspicious, uninterested, or had moved away without leaving a forwarding address. The administration took five weeks to complete.

Chapter 3

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter will deal with the treatment of the data. Chi square and analysis of variance were used for analysis. For the analysis of variance some of the responses were artificially dichotomized to meet the assumption of ordinal data. The analysis will be presented in four parts: (1) Descriptive Analysis, (2) Analysis of Relationships, (3) Analysis of Variance, and (4) Frequency Distribution.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Students and Parents

The two samples for this study included one student and one parent group. A total of 100 ninth graders were administered the questionnaire discussed in Chapter 2. Of these students 55 were male and 45 were female. Of this population, 31 were classified as high, 42 as medium, and 27 as low educational achievers. This classification was determined by their placement in English and mathematics sequence. These students were placed in either sequence 1 (enriched), sequence 2 (standard), or sequence 3 (basic) based upon their school grades, achievement scores, recommendation of their teachers, counselors, and parent consent.

Upon the recommendation of local school officials, English was used as the basis for classification as the following chart will illustrate:

Chart 1

Course and Sequence		Educational Achievement	Total
English 1 Mathematics 1		high	
English 1 Mathematics 2	=	high	
English 1 Mathematics 3	=	high	31
English 2 Mathematics 1	=	medium	
English 2 Mathematics 2	=	medium	
English 2 Mathematics 3	=	medium	42
English 3 Mathematics 1	=	low	
English 3 Mathematics 2	=	low	
English 3 Mathematics 3	=	low	27
		GRAND TOTAL	100

A total of 76 parents were interviewed by means of the questionnaire described in Chapter 2. Of this total 21 were males and 55 were females. The median years of education was six. Out of this group 53% had some elementary, 40 percent had some junior and senior high education. Only 7 percent had graduated from high school or had some college education. Out of this group 63 percent were earning $3000 per year or less while 37 percent were earning between $3500 to $5000 per year.

ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP

Relationship Between Students' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Educational Achievement

The data collected for investigation were analyzed by means of chi square. The analysis indicated no significant relationships existed except in few cases which might be attributed to chance between cultural characteristics and educational achievement at the .05 level of probability. There were only 10 significant of 116 possibilities.

Ethnic isolation. On the theme of Ethnic Isolation there were no significant relationships out of a possible 25.

Spanish language. The Spanish Language category yielded only two significant relationships out of 26. They were:

Table I

Item 19

Do you ever go see Mexican movies?

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
Yes	85 (85.9)	31 (100.0)	33 (80.5)	21 (77.8)
No	14 (14.1)	0 (0.0)	8 (19.5)	6 (22.2)
Total	99 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	41 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 7.532* at .05 level Df=2

Table II

Item 40

Do you think the Headstart program will help students like yourself?

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
NR	1			
Yes	78 (79.6)	29 (96.7)	32 (78.0)	17 (63.0)
No	6 (6.1)	1 (3.1)	2 (4.9)	3 (11.1)
Don't know	14 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	7 (17.1)	7 (25.9)
Total	100 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	42 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 10.701* at .05 level Df=4

Fatalism. There was one significant relationship out of 9 from the Fatalism category. It was:

Table III

Item 43

Good luck is more important than hard work for success.

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
NR	1			
Agree	15 (15.2)	5 (16.1)	1 (2.4)	9 (33.3)
Dis-agree	84 (84.8)	26 (83.9)	40 (97.6)	18 (66.7)
Total	100 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	41 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 12.120* at .02 level Df=2

Present day orientation. Present Day Orientation yielded one out of four possibilities. The item was:

Table IV

Item 58

How do you feel about raising children?

A. Children should be taught the traditions of the past (the ways of the old people) because the old ways are best. When children do not follow the old ways things go wrong.

B. Children should be taught some of the old traditions (ways of the old people), but it is wrong to insist that they stick to these ways. It is necessary for children to learn about and accept whatever new ways will best help them get along in the world of today.

C. Children should not be taught much about past traditions at all except as an interesting story of what has gone before. Children would be better off when they are taught the things that will make them want to replace the old.

Table IV (continued)

Which idea do you agree with?

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
NR	1			
A. (Past)	6 (6.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.8)	4 (15.4)
B. (Present)	59 (59.6)	24 (77.4)	23 (54.8)	12 (46.2)
C. (Future)	34 (34.3)	7 (22.6)	17 (40.5)	10 (38.5)
Total	100 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	42 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 10.168* at .05 level Df=4

Limited aspirations. The theme of Limited Aspirations had two significant relationships out of 28 possibilities. They were as follows:

Table V

Item 64

How many years of education do you think your future children should have?

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
No Response	3 (0.0)	1	1	1
Same as you	34 (35.1)	11 (36.7)	15 (36.6)	8 (30.8)
Less than you	6 (6.2)	1 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	5 (19.2)
More than you	57 (58.8)	18 (60.0)	26 (63.4)	13 (50.0)
Total	100 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	42 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 10.768* significant at .05 level Df=4

Table VI

Item 65

Do you think your future daughters should try to get as much education as your sons do? If answer is No, why?

Girls belong in the home.

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
No Response	3	0	3	0
Checked	18 (18.6)	1 (3.2)	11 (28.2)	6 (22.2)
Not checked	79 (81.4)	30 (96.8)	28 (71.8)	21 (77.8)
Total	100 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	42 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 7.463* significant at .05 level Df=2

Machismo. There were three significant relationships out of 18 Machismo items, item 66 mentioned above and the following:

Table VII

Item 53

Men can do anything they want to do but the women should not?

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
No Response	0	0	0	0
Agree	33 (33.0)	5 (16.1)	15 (35.7)	13 (48.1)
Disagree	67 (67.0)	26 (83.9)	27 (64.3)	14 (51.9)
Total	100 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	42 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.933* significant at .05 level Df=2

Table VIII

Item 41

Would you rather have a male or a female teacher?

	Total (%)	High (%)	Medium (%)	Low (%)
No Response	2	1	1	1
Male	7 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.3)	5 (18.5)
Female	22 (22.4)	4 (13.3)	15 (36.6)	3 (11.1)
Makes no difference	69 (70.4)	26 (86.7)	24 (58.5)	19 (70.4)
Total	100 (100.0)	31 (100.0)	42 (100.0)	27 (100.0)

χ^2 = 15.582* significant at .01 level Df=4

Family solidarity. The Family Solidarity theme yielded only one significant relationship out of 15 items. The item is no. 66, the same one described above for Machismo and Limited Aspirations.

Relationship Between Students' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Sex

This data was also analyzed by means of chi square. The results showed little significant relationships between Cultural Characteristics and Sex. There were only 12 statistically significant relationships out of 116 possibilities.

Ethnic isolation. Out of 25 Ethnic Isolation items only one was significant. It was:

Table IX

Item 3

Do you have any relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters who live in another neighborhood?

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	2	1	1
Yes	66 (67.3)	42 (77.8)	24 (54.5)
No	32 (32.7)	12 (22.2)	20 (45.5)
Total	100 (100.0)	55 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 5.951 significant at .02 level Df=1

Spanish language. The Spanish Language theme yielded just two significant relationships. They were as follows:

Table X

Item 39

Do you think bilingual education will help students more than just teaching them in one language?

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	2	1	1
Yes	53 (54.1)	23 (42.6)	30 (68.2)
No	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Don't know	45 (45.9)	31 (57.4)	14 (31.8)
Total	100 (100.0)	35 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.393* at .05 level Df=2

Table XI

Item 27

Can you write in English? (If yes, has your ability to speak English:

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	1	1	0
Helped you to write English	20 (20.2)	6 (11.1)	14 (31.1)
Not helped you to write English	20 (20.2)	14 (25.9)	6 (13.3)
Made no difference	59 (59.6)	34 (63.0)	25 (55.6)
Total	100 (100.0)	55 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 7.013* at .05 level of significance

Fatalism. There were no significant relationships between the variables sex and nine Fatalism items.

Present day orientation. There were no significant results between four Present Day Orientation items and sex.

Limited aspirations. There were five significant relationships out of 28 Limited Aspiration items. Two were significant at the .001 level, two at the .02 level, and one at the .01 level. They were as follows:

Table XII

Item 60

What would you most like to do as a life work?

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	2	2	0
Professional	48 (49.0)	26 (49.1)	22 (48.9)
Managerial	11 (11.2)	8 (15.1)	3 (6.7)
White collar	22 (22.4)	2 (3.8)	20 (44.4)
Skill or trade	16 (16.3)	16 (30.2)	0 (0.0)
Unskilled	1 (1.0)	1 (1.9)	0 (0.0)
Total	100 (100.0)	55 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 33.906* significant at .001 level Df=4

Table XIII

Item 62

What do you think might keep you from doing the work which you would most like to do?

i. would rather get a job

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	0	0	0
Yes	83 (83.0)	41 (74.5)	42 (93.3)
No	17 (17.0)	14 (25.5)	3 (6.7)
Total	100 (100.0)	55 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.192* at .02 level of significance Df=1

Table XIV

Item 66

Do you think your future daughters should try to get as much education as your sons do?

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	0	0	0
Yes	83 (83.0)	41 (74.5)	42 (93.3)
No	17 (17.0)	14 (25.5)	3 (6.7)
Total	100 (100.0)	55 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.192* at .02 level of significance Df=1

Table XV

Item 67

If No, (to above question), Why?

b. girls belong at home to learn housework.

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	3	3	0
Checked	18 (18.6)	15 (28.8)	3 (6.7)
Not checked	79 (81.4)	37 (71.2)	42 (93.3)
Total	100 (100.0)	55 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 7.852* at .01 level of significance.

Machismo. Out of 18 Machismo items three were significant. Items 66 and 67 described above also were used to yield attitudes toward Machismo characteristics. The other significant item was:

Table XVI

Item 41

Would you rather have a male or a female teacher?

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	2	2	0
Male	7 (7.2)	1 (1.9)	6 (13.3)
Female	22 (22.4)	16 (30.2)	6 (13.3)
No difference	69 (70.4)	36 (67.9)	33 (73.3)
Total	100 (100.0)	55 (100.0)	45 (100.0)

χ^2 = 7.645* at .05 level of significance Df=2

Family solidarity. Family Solidarity theme disclosed only one significant relationship out of 16. It was item number 67 which was also used in the Limited Aspirations and Machismo theme described above.

Relationship Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Educational Level

Chi square was used to investigate the relationship between the Cultural Characteristics and Education. The results showed very few items which were significantly related. There were only 7 significant relationships out of 121 possibilities.

Ethnic isolation. There were two significant relationships out of 24 items in the Ethnic Isolation group. They were:

Table XVII

Item 4

Do you have any close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters who live within walking distance of your home? (Check all applicable)

Parents	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	0	0	0	0
Checked	8 (10.8)	1 (2.6)	5 (16.7)	2 (40.0)
Not checked	68 (89.2)	38 (97.4)	25 (83.3)	3 (60.0)
Total	76 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)

χ^2 = 8.236* at .02 level of significance Df=2

Table XVIII

Item 12

Do you think there is any chance of your moving in the next 12 months?

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	0	0	0	0
Yes	9 (12.2)	1 (2.6)	6 (20.0)	2 (40.0)
No	67 (87.7)	38 (97.4)	24 (80.0)	3 (60.0)
Total	76 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)

χ^2 = 8.715* at .02 level of significance Df=2

Spanish language. The Spanish Language category yielded three significant relationships out of 21 possibilities. They were:

Table XIX

Item 25

Do you speak English?

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	2	2	0	0
Yes	64 (86.1)	27 (73.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)
No	10 (13.9)	10 (27.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Total	76 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)

χ^2 = 10.985* at .01 level of significance Df=2

Table XX

Item 27

Can you write in English?

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	1	1	0	0
Yes	60 (79.5)	24 (63.2)	29 (96.7)	5 (100.0)
No	15 (20.5)	14 (36.8)	1 (3.3)	0 (0.0)
Total	76 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)

χ^2 = 12.918* at .02 level of significance Df=2

Table XXI

Item 29

Did you speak English before you entered school?

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	2	1	1	0
Yes	20 (26.4)	7 (18.4)	7 (24.1)	5 (100.0)
No	54 (73.6)	31 (81.6)	22 (75.9)	0 (0.0)
Total	76 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)

χ^2 = 15.265* at .001 level of significance Df=2

Fatalism. There were no statistically significant relationships in the Fatalism group from a possibility of nine.

Present day orientation. There were no statistically significant relationships in the Present Day Orientation theme out of four items.

Limited aspirations. There was one significant relationship out of 31 Limited Aspirations items. It was:

Table XXII

Item 55

What would you most like your ninth grade daughter to do as a life work?

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	27	11	15	1
Professional (teacher, nurse, etc.)	33 (66.0)	21 (35.0)	6 (40.0)	4 (100.0)
Managerial (manager, etc.)	14 (29.8)	7 (25.0)	7 (46.7)	0 (0.0)
White collar (secretary, etc.)	2 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)
Total	76 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)

χ^2 = 9.691* at .05 level of significance Df=4

Machismo. There were no significant relationships between the educational level of the parents and the Machismo items at the .05 level of significance.

Family solidarity. There was one statistically significant relationship out of 15 Family Solidarity items. It was:

Table XXIII

Item 48

Your family is more important than you.

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	0	0	0	0
Agree	74 (97.3)	38 (97.4)	30 (100.0)	4 (80.0)
Disagree	2 (2.7)	1 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (20.0)
Total	76 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	5 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.525ª at .05 level of significance Df=2

Relationship Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Sex

This data was analyzed by means of chi square. The results indicated few statistically significant relationships between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Sex. The chi square test of significance disclosed 13 significant relationships out of 121 computations.

Ethnic isolation. The Ethnic Isolation theme disclosed one significant relationship out of 24. It was:

Table XXIV

Item 5

If yes to question 4 (Do any of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live within walking distance of your home?) Which relatives live within walking distance? (Check all applicable)

Sisters	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
Checked	15 (19.7)	1 (4.8)	14 (25.5)
Not checked	61 (80.3)	20 (95.2)	41 (74.5)
Total	76 (100.0)	21 (100.0)	55 (100.0)

χ^2 = 4.108* at .05 level of significance Df=1

Table XXV

Item 10

How did you move here?

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
No Response	14	4	10
Came with parents	20 (34.5)	2 (13.3)	18 (41.9)
Came with husband or wife	38 (65.5)	13 (86.7)	25 (58.1)
Total	72 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	53 (100.0)

χ^2 = 4.006* at .05 level Df=1

Fatalism. There were no statistically significant relationships in the Fatalism items.

Present day orientation. Present Day Orientation items were not significant when compared with Parents' sex.

Limited aspirations. Out of 31 Limited Aspiration items there were no significant relationships.

Machismo. Out of 17 Machismo items six were statistically significant. They were as follows:

Table XXVI

Item 65

Here are some things that might be done by a husband or wife in the home. Think about your home as I read them to you. Are these things usually done by you, by your husband (wife), or by both of you? If neither, if it were done by one of you, which would it be?

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
(1) Painting rooms in the house?			
No Response	2	1	1
Husband	22 (31.0)	10 (50.0)	12 (23.5)
Wife	17 (23.9)	1 (5.0)	16 (31.4)
Both	32 (45.1)	9 (45.0)	23 (45.1)
Total	73 (100.0)	21 (100.0)	52 (100.0)

^{2} = 7.422* at .05 level of significance Df=2

Table XXVI (continued)

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
(2) Getting up at night to take care of the children if they cry?			
No Response	1	0	1
Husband	2 (2.7)	2 (9.5)	0 (0.0)
Wife	54 (73.0)	8 (38.1)	46 (86.8)
Both	18 (24.3)	11 (52.4)	7 (13.2)
Total	75 (100.0)	21 (100.0)	54 (100.0)
χ^2 = 19.424* at .001 level of significance Df=2			
(3) Picking out more expensive things like furniture or a car?			
No Response	3	1	2
Husband	8 (11.4)	3 (15.0)	5 (10.0)
Wife	24 (34.3)	2 (10.0)	22 (44.0)
Both	38 (54.0)	15 (75.0)	23 (46.0)
Total	73 (100.0)	21 (100.0)	52 (100.0)
χ^2 = 7.342* at .05 level of significance Df=2			
(6) Taking care of the children when they are sick?			
No Response	2	1	1
Husband	5 (6.8)	3 (15.0)	2 (3.8)
Wife	45 (61.6)	7 (35.0)	38 (71.7)
Both	23 (31.5)	10 (50.0)	13 (24.5)
Total	75 (100.0)	21 (100.0)	54 (100.0)
χ^2 = 8.834* at .02 level of significance Df=2			

Table XXVI (continued)

	Total (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
(8) Buying the groceries?			
No Response	1	0	1
Husband	6 (8.0)	4 (19.0)	2 (3.7)
Wife	49 (65.3)	10 (47.0)	39 (72.2)
Both	20 (26.7)	7 (33.3)	13 (24.1)
Total	76 (100.0)	21 (100.0)	55 (100.0)
χ^2 = 6.337* at .05 level of significance			Df=2
(10) Goes to P.T.A. Meetings?			
No Response	2	1	1
Husband	5 (7.7)	2 (11.1)	3 (6.4)
Wife	37 (56.9)	5 (37.8)	32 (68.1)
Both	23 (35.4)	11 (61.1)	12 (25.5)
Total	67 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	48 (100.0)
χ^2 = 8.749* at .05 level of significance			Df=2
(13) Does cooking?			
No Response	1	1	0
Husband	3 (4.1)	1 (5.0)	2 (3.7)
Wife	66 (89.2)	15 (75.0)	51 (94.4)
Both	5 (6.8)	4 (20.0)	1 (1.9)
Total	75 (100.0)	21 (100.0)	54 (100.0)
χ^2 = 7.793* at .05 level of significance			Df=2

Family solidarity. There were six significant relationships out of 15 possibilities. The relationships are mentioned above in Table XXVI.

Relationship Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Income

This data when analyzed by means of chi square disclosed nine statistically significant relationships out of 121 possibilities.

Ethnic isolation. There was one significant relationship out of 24 Ethnic Isolation items. It was:

Table XXVII

Item 5

Do any of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live within walking distance of your home? (If yes to above question, which relative?)

Parents	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	0	0	0	0
Yes	8 (11.3)	5 (26.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)
No	68 (88.7)	14 (73.7)	20 (100.0)	21 (91.3)
Total	76 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	23 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.983* at .05 level of significance Df=2

Spanish language. The Spanish Language theme had one statistically significant relationship out of 21 items. It was:

Table XXVIII

Item 32

What language do your children understand better?

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	0	0	0	0
Spanish	7 (6.5)	1 (5.3)	2 (10.0)	1 (4.3)
English	32 (41.9)	2 (10.5)	11 (55.0)	13 (56.5)
Both	37 (51.6)	16 (84.2)	7 (35.0)	9 (39.1)
Total	76 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	23 (100.0)

χ^2 = 12.716* at .02 level of significance Df=4

Fatalism. Out of nine Fatalistic items there was only one significant relationship. It was:

Table XXIX

Item 44

People like me who are born poor will be poor all their lives.

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
No Response	0	0	0	0
Agree	13 (17.7)	0 (0.0)	4 (20.0)	7 (30.4)
Disagree	63 (82.3)	19 (100.0)	16 (80.0)	16 (69.6)
Total	76 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	23 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.707* at .05 level of significance Df=2

Present day orientation. There were no significant relationships out of four Present Day Orientation items.

Limited aspirations. There was one significant relationship out of 31 possible relationships. It was:

Table XXX

Item 57

What do you think might keep your son or daughter from doing the work which you would most like him or her to do? (Check all appropriate).

c. Not enough money

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
Checked	28 (38.7)	13 (68.4)	5 (25.0)	6 (26.1)
Not checked	48 (61.3)	6 (31.6)	15 (75.0)	17 (73.9)
Total	76 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	23 (100.0)

χ^2 = 10.199 at .01 level of significance Df=2

Machismo. There were two significant relationships in the Machismo theme. They were as follows:

Table XXXI

Item 65

Here are some things that might be done by a husband or wife in the home. Think about your home as I read them to you. Are these things usually done by you, by your husband (wife) or by both of you? If neither, if it were done by one of you, which would it be?

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
(1) Painting in the house?				
No Response	1	1	0	1
Husband	22 (27.1)	5 (29.4)	4 (20.0)	7 (31.8)
Wife	17 (45.4)	9 (52.9)	4 (20.0)	2 (9.1)
Both	32 (47.5)	3 (17.6)	12 (60.0)	13 (59.1)
Total	73 (100.0)	18 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	23 (100.0)

χ^2 = 12.663* significant at .02 level Df=4

	Total (%)	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
(2) Getting up at night to take care of the children if they cry?				
No Response	1	0	1	0
Husband	2 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)
Wife	54 (68.9)	17 (89.5)	14 (73.7)	11 (47.8)
Both	18 (27.9)	2 (10.5)	5 (26.3)	10 (43.5)
Total	75 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	23 (100.0)

χ^2 = 10.097* at .05 level of significance Df=4

Family solidarity. There were two significant relationships out of 15 possibilities. They were items 65 (1) and (2) described above in the *Machismo* category.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Analysis of Variance Between Students' and Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics

Table XXXII

Students and Parents

Cultural characteristic	Source	Sum of squares	Mean square	Degrees of freedom	F-ratio	Significance level
Ethnic Isolation	Between Groups	217.1	217.1	1	17.972	.000*
	Within Groups	2102.6	12.0	174		
Spanish Language	Between Groups	42.2	42.2	1	6.631	.011*
	Within Groups	1108.2	6.3	174		
Fatalism	Between Groups	2.0	2.0	1	.471	.494
	Within Groups	743.4	4.2	174		
Machismo	Between Groups	129.2	129.2	1	14.427	.000*
	Within Groups	1558.7	8.9	174		
Family Solidarity	Between Groups	55.4	55.4	1	5.249	.023*
	Within Groups	1838.0	10.5	174		
Present Day Orientation	Between Groups	13.5	13.5	1	6.342	.013*
	Within Groups	370.8	.21	174		
Limited Aspirations	Between Groups	66.2	66.2	1	26.101	.000*
	Within Groups	441.4	2.5	174		

*$p < .001$

Analysis of Variance Between Students' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Educational Achievement

Table XXXIII

Students - Education

Cultural characteristic	Source	Sum of squares	Mean square	Degrees of freedom	F-ratio	Significance level
Ethnic Isolation	Between Groups	41.3	20.6	2	1.970	.145
	Within Groups	1017.3	10.4	97		
Spanish Language	Between Groups	9.1	4.5	2	.632	.534
	Within Groups	700.3	7.2	97		
Fatalism	Between Groups	11.3	5.6	2	1.859	.161
	Within Groups	297.3	3.0	97		
Machismo	Between Groups	.96	.48	2	.088	.916
	Within Groups	534.7	5.5	97		
Family Solidarity	Between Groups	5.8	2.9	2	.385	.681
	Within Groups	741.4	7.6	97		
Present Day Orientation	Between Groups	8.4	4.2	2	1.935	.150
	Within Groups	211.5	2.1	97		
Limited Aspirations	Between Groups	2.3	1.1	2	.351	.705
	Within Groups	327.1	3.37	97		

Analysis of Variance Between Students' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Sex

Table XXXIV

Students - Sex

Cultural characteristic	Source	Sum of squares	Mean square	Degrees of freedom	F-ratio	Significance level
Ethnic Isolation	Between Groups Within Groups	60.8 997.8	6.08 10.1	1 98	5.974	.016*
Spanish Language	Between Groups Within Groups	10.0 699.3	10.0 7.1	1	1.413	.237
Fatalism	Between Groups Within Groups	.56 308.1	.56 3.1	1 98	.181	.672
Machismo	Between Groups Within Groups	20.1 515.5	20.1 5.2	1 98	3.837	.053
Family Solidarity	Between Groups Within Groups	13.3 734.0	13.3 7.4	1 98	1.777	.186
Present Day Orientation	Between Groups Within Groups	.97 218.9	.97 2.2	1 98	.434	.512
Limited Aspirations	Between Groups Within Groups	2.0 327.5	2.0 3.3	1 98	.609	.437

*$p < .001$

Analysis of Variance Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Educational Level

Table XXXV

Parents - Education

Cultural characteristic	Source	Sum of squares	Mean square	Degrees of freedom	F-ratio	Significance level
Ethnic Isolation	Between Groups	9.6	4.8	2	.340	.713
	Within Groups	1034.	14.1	73		
Spanish Language	Between Groups	34.6	17.3	2	3.476	.036
	Within Groups	364.0	49.8	73		
Fatalism	Between Groups	.892	.446	2	.075	.928
	Within Groups	433.7	5.9	73		
Machismo	Between Groups	10.3	5.1	2	.373	.690
	Within Groups	1012.6	13.8	73		
Family Solidarity	Between Groups	10.3	5.1	2	.349	.707
	Within Groups	1080.4	14.8	73		
Present Day Orientation	Between Groups	7.4	3.7	2	1.891	.158
	Within Groups	143.4	1.9	73		
Limited Aspiration	Between Groups	1.0	.527	2	.348	.708
	Within Groups	110.8	1.5	73		

Analysis of Variance Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Sex

Table XXXVI

Parents - Sex

Cultural characteristic	Source	Sum of squares	Mean square	Degree of freedom	F-ratio	Significance level
Ethnic Isolation	Between Groups	32.2	32.2	1	2.360	.129
	Within Groups	1011.7	13.6	74		
Spanish Language	Between Groups	14.0	14.0	1	2.695	.105
	Within Groups	384.7	5.1	74		
Fatalism	Between Groups	4.0	4.0	1	.702	.405
	Within Groups	430.5	5.8	74		
Machismo	Between Groups	57.2	57.2	1	4.388	.040
	Within Groups	965.7	13.0	74		
Family Solidarity	Between Groups	73.9	73.9	1	5.383	.023*
	Within Groups	1016.7	13.7	74		
Present Day Orientation	Between Groups	.72	.72	1	.359	.551
	Within Groups	150.1	2.0	74		
Limited Aspiration	Between Groups	1.6	1.6	1	1.109	.296
	Within Groups	110.2	1.4	74		

*$p < .001$

Analysis of Variance Between Parents' Perception of Cultural Characteristics and Income

Table XXXVII

Parents - Income

Cultural characteristic	Source	Sum of squares	Mean square	Degree of freedom	F-ratio	Significance level
Ethnic Isolation	Between Groups	77.4	38.7	2	2.925	.060
	Within Groups	966.5	13.2	73		
Spanish Language	Between Groups	8.7	4.3	2	.823	.443
	Within Groups	389.	5.3	73		
Fatalism	Between Groups	.63	.31	2	.053	.948
	Within Groups	434.0	5.9	73		
Machismo	Between Groups	67.0	33.5	2	2.560	.084
	Within Groups	955.9	13.0	73		
Family Solidarity	Between Groups	81.2	40.6	2	2.937	.059
	Within Groups	1009.5	13.8	73		
Present Day Orientation	Between Groups	.19	.095	2	.046	.955
	Within,Groups	150.6	2.0	73		
Limited Aspiration	Between Groups	2.5	1.2	2	.862	.427
	Within Groups	109.3	1.4	73		

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS' AND PARENTS' RESPONSES

Students

	N	%
Sex		
Boy	55	55.0
Girl	45	45.0
Sequence (Educational Achievement)		
High	31	31.0
Medium	42	42.0
Low	27	27.0

Parents

Sex		
Male	21	27.63
Female	55	72.37
Position in Household		
Head	45	60.81
Spouse	29	39.19
Education (years of schooling completed)		
Elementary		
1	7	9.46
2	2	2.70
3	8	10.81
4	6	8.11
5	5	6.76
6	11	14.86
7	7	9.46
8	5	6.76
9	6	8.11
10	4	5.41
11	7	9.46
12	1	1.35
High School Graduate or GED	2	2.70
Commercial College	-	-
Vocational Training	1	1.35
College	-	-
1	-	-
2	1	1.35
3	-	-
4	-	-
College Graduate	-	-
Post Graduate	-	-

How many living at home?	N	%
1	1	1.37
2	-	-
3	7	9.59
4	13	17.81
5	12	16.44
6	11	15.07
7	6	8.22
8	8	10.96
9	5	6.85
10	8	10.96
11	-	-
12	2	2.74
Sex of 9th grade student		
Boy	31	46.27
Girl	36	53.73

Questionnaire Items

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
How long have you lived in your present house (apartment)?				
a. 0-3 years	14	18.4	21	21.2
b. 4-6 years	12	15.7	15	15.1
c. 7-10 years	12	15.7	14	14.1
d. 11-20 years	27	35.5	12	12.1
e. all your life	11	14.4	37	37.3
Do most of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live in Corpus Christi?				
a. yes	51	68.92	85	85.0
b. no	23	31.08	15	15.0
Do you have any relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters who live in another neighborhood other than this neighborhood?				
a. yes	48	65.75	66	67.35
b. no	25	34.25	32	32.65

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
Do any of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live within walking distance of your home?				
a. yes	38	52.78	66	67.35
b. no	34	47.22	40	40.0

(If yes to above question) Which relatives live within walking distance? (Check all applicable)

	Parents			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. Grandparents	3	4.0	72	96.0
b. Parents (either father or mother or both)	8	10.53	68	89.47
c. Brother(s)	18	23.68	58	76.32
d. Sister(s)	15	19.74	61	80.26
e. Children	7	9.21	69	90.79
f. Uncles	3	3.95	73	96.05
g. Compadres	7	9.21	69	90.79

	Students			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. Grandparents	11	11.11	88	88.89
b. Parents (either father or mother or both)	4	4.04	95	95.96
c. Brother(s)	16	16.16	83	83.84
d. Sister(s)	16	16.16	83	83.84
e. Children	2	2.02	97	97.98
f. Uncles	33	33.33	66	66.67
g. Compadres	12	12.12	87	87.88

(If yes to above question) How often do you talk to them?

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
a. every day	34	56.67	24	34.29
b. once or twice a week	8	13.33	22	31.43
c. once or twice a month	4	6.67	4	5.71
d. very little	8	13.33	16	22.86
e. almost never	3	5.00	4	5.7
e. never	-		-	

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
Where were you born?				
a. Texas	56	76.71	92	92.00
b. Mexico	13	17.81	4	4.00
c. In the United States but not in Texas	4	5.48	4	4.00
Where did you live last?				
a. In Corpus Christi	37	51.39	87	89.69
b. Out of Corpus Christi	35	48.61	10	10.31
(If you lived outside of Corpus Christi) How long did you live there?				
a. a few months	1	1.92	8	32.0
b. 1-3 years	6	11.54	5	20.0
c. 4-6 years	4	7.69	2	8.0
d. 7-9 years	4	7.69	4	16.0
e. more than 10 years	37	71.15	6	24.0
How did you move here?				
a. came with parents	20	32.26	46	83.64
b. came with husband or wife	27	43.55	1	1.82
c. came alone to find work	11	17.74	-	-
d. came with friends	4	6.45	-	-
e. other - explain	-	-	8	14.55

Why did you decide to move to this part of Corpus Christi? (Check all applicable)

	Parents			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. rent is inexpensive	7	9.21	69	90.79
b. close to work	27	35.53	49	64.47
c. couldn't rent or buy anywhere else	7	9.21	69	90.79
d. had relatives here	22	28.95	54	71.05
e. had friends here	3	3.95	73	96.05

	Students			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. rent is inexpensive	1	1.05	94	98.95
b. close to work	9	9.47	86	90.53
c. couldn't rent or buy anywhere else	7	7.37	88	92.63
d. had relatives here	5	16.84	79	83.16
e. had friends here	4	4.21	91	95.79
f. came with parents	38	40.0	57	60.0

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
Do you think there is any chance of you moving in the next 12 months?				
a. yes	9	11.84	21	21.88
b. no	67	88.16	75	78.13
(If yes) Do you plan to stay in the Corpus Christi area?				
a. yes	47	87.04	56	88.89
b. no	7	12.96	7	11.11
(If yes) Do you plan to stay in Texas?				
a. yes	54	94.74	68	97.14
b. no	3	5.26	2	2.86
Do you speak Spanish?				
a. yes	73	96.05	99	99.0
b. no	3	3.95	1	1.0
(If answer is yes) How well do you speak Spanish?				
a. Very well	27	35.53	4	4.04
b. Well	34	44.74	41	41.41
c. Fair	15	19.74	50	50.51
d. Poor	-	-	4	4.04
Do you listen to radio programs from Mexico?				
a. yes	59	37.63	30	30.0
b. no	17	22.37	68	70.0
(If answer is yes) Do you have any problem understanding them?				
a. no	43	64.18	25	51.02
b. yes	21	31.34	5	10.20
c. a little	3	4.48	19	38.78
Do you ever go to see Mexican movies?				
a. yes	57	78.08	86	86.0
b. no	16	21.92	14	14.0

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
(If answer is yes) Do you have any problem understanding these movies?				
a. no	41	59.42	42	45.16
b. yes	22	31.88	8	8.60
c. a little	6	8.70	43	46.24
Do you ever read a newspaper, magazine or letters printed in Spanish?				
a. yes	53	70.67	58	58.0
b. no	22	29.33	42	42.0
If your answer is yes, how well do you read?				
a. very well	18	28.57	3	3.95
b. well	25	39.68	12	15.79
c. good	12	19.05	9	11.84
d. fair	5	7.94	34	44.74
e. poorly	3	4.76	18	23.68
Can you write in Spanish?				
a. yes	54	72.00	54	54.0
b. no	21	28.00	46	46.0
If your answer is yes, how well do you write?				
a. well	27	46.55	7	11.29
b. good	22	37.93	17	27.42
c. fair	9	15.52	38	61.29
Do you speak English?				
a. yes	64	86.49	96	96.0
b. no	10	13.51	4	4.0
(If your answer is yes) Do you think your ability to speak Spanish has:				
a. helped you to speak English	27	38.57	27	28.13
b. not helped you to speak English	7	10.00	13	13.54
c. made no difference	36	51.43	56	58.33
Can you write in English?				
a. yes	60	80.00	98	98.99
b. no	15	20.00	1	1.01

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
(If your answer is yes) Has your ability to speak Spanish				
a. helped you to write in English	30	44.12	20	20.2
b. not helped you to write in English	8	11.76	20	20.2
c. made no difference	30	44.12	59	59.6
Did you speak English before you entered school?				
a. yes	20	27.03	50	51.02
b. no	54	72.97	48	48.98
Do your children speak both English and Spanish?			Not applicable	
a. yes	71	94.67		
b. no	4	5.33		
What language did your children learn to speak first?				
a. Spanish	44	57.89	Not applicable	
b. English	5	6.58		
c. Both	27	35.53		
What language do your children understand better?				
a. Spanish	7	9.21	12	12.0
b. English	32	42.11	34	34.0
c. Both equally the same	37	48.68	54	54.0
If your child speaks and understands both languages, do you think it is important for him to learn to read and write in Spanish as well as English?				
a. yes	74	98.67	89	91.75
b. no	1	1.33	8	8.25
What language do you speak in your home?				
a. Mostly Spanish	22	28.95	37	37.0
b. Mostly English	2	2.63	9	9.0
c. Only Spanish	5	6.58	15	15.0
d. Only English	–	–	2	2.0
e. Both	47	61.84	37	37.0

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
Do you think Bi-lingual Education will help your children more than just teaching them in one language?				
a. yes	67	88.16	53	54.08
b. no	6	7.89	45	45.92
c. I don't know	3	3.95	-	-
Good luck is more important than hard work for success.				
a. agree	21	28.00	15	15.15
b. disagree	54	72.00	84	84.85
Everytime I try to get ahead, something or someone stops me.				
a. agree	26	34.21	51	51.52
b. disagree	50	65.79	48	48.48
People like me do not have much of a chance to be successful in life.				
a. agree	27	36.00	24	24.0
b. disagree	48	64.00	76	76.0
Doing school work makes the future easier.				
a. agree	61	81.33	87	87.88
b. disagree	14	18.67	12	12.12
School will not help my children in the future.				
a. agree	12	15.79	9	9.0
b. disagree	64	84.21	91	91.0
School will not help my children get a better job.				
a. agree	12	16.00	7	7.0
b. disagree	63	84.00	93	93.0
People like me should not expect too much of life so that I will not be disappointed.				
a. agree	28	39.36	61	61.0
b. disagree	45	61.64	39	39.0

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
Planning my future ahead of time is a waste of time because I cannot alter my future.				
a. agree	21	28.77	41	41.41
b. disagree	52	71.23	58	58.59
People like me who are born poor will be poor all their lives.				
a. agree	13	17.11	7	7.0
b. disagree	63	82.89	93	93.0
Men are always smarter than women.				
a. agree	17	22.97	10	10.10
b. disagree	57	77.03	89	89.90
Men can do anything they want to do but the women should not.				
a. agree	35	46.05	33	33.0
b. disagree	41	53.95	67	67.0
Women cannot always do what they want.				
a. agree	44	57.89	74	74.0
b. disagree	32	42.11	26	26.0
Your family is more important than you.				
a. agree	74	97.37	79	79.0
b. disagree	2	2.63	21	21.0

Here are some other ways of looking at life:

a. Some people believe it best to give most attention to what is happening now in the present. They say that the past has gone and the future is much too uncertain to count on.

b. Some people think that the ways of the past were the most right and the best, and as changes come things get worse.

c. Some people believe that it is the ways of the future which will be best, and they say that although there are sometime disappointments, change brings improvements in the long run.

Which one of these ways of looking at life do you think is best?

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
a. Present	20	26.32	30	30.0
b. Past	13	17.11	14	14.0
c. Future	43	56.58	56	56.0

Three young people were talking about what they thought their families would one day be as compared with their fathers and mothers. They each said different things.

a. The first one said: "I expect my family to be better off in the future than the family of my father and mother if we work hard and play right. Things in this country usually get better for people."

b. The second one said: "I don't know whether my family will be better off, the same, or worse off than the family of my father and mother. Things always go up and down even if people do work hard. So no one can ever really tell how things will be."

c. The third one said: "I expect my family to be about the same as the family of my father and mother. The best way is to work hard and plan ways to keep up things as they have been in the past."

Which one of these young people do you think had the best idea?

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
a.	31	40.79	16	16.0
b.	30	39.47	51	51.0
c.	15	19.74	33	33.0

How do you feel about the future of your children?

a. I really expect my children to have more than I have had if they work hard and plan right. There are always good chances for people who try.

b. I don't know whether my children will be better off, worse off, or just the same as I am. Things always go up and down even if one works hard, so, I can't really tell.

c. I expect my children to have just about the same as I have had.

Which idea do you agree with?

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
a.	54	72.00	16	16.0
b.	17	22.67	51	51.0
c.	4	5.33	33	33.0

How do you feel about raising children. Here are three different ideas.

a. Children should be taught the traditions of the past (the ways of the old people) because the old ways are best. When children do not follow the old ways things go wrong.

b. Children should be taught some of the old traditions (ways of the old people), but it is wrong to insist that they stick to these ways. It is necessary for children to learn about and accept whatever new ways will best help them get along in the world of today.

c. Children should not be taught much about past traditions at all except as an interesting story of what has gone before. Children would be better off when they are taught the things that will make them want to find out for themselves new ways of doing things to replace the old.

Which idea do you agree with?

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
a.	8	10.53	6	6.06
b.	37	46.68	59	59.60
c.	31	40.79	34	34.34

What would you most like your 9th grade son to do as a life work?

	Parents	
	N	%
a. professional	28	52.83
b. managerial occupation	4	7.55
c. white collar	8	15.09
d. skill or tradesman	10	18.87
e. unskilled worker	3	5.66

What do you think he will really do if he finishes high school?

		Parents	
		N	%
a.	professional	24	42.11
b.	managerial occupation	4	7.02
c.	white collar worker	9	15.79
d.	skill or tradesman	14	24.56
e.	unskilled	2	3.51
f.	armed service	4	7.02

What would you most like your 9th grade daughter to do as a life work?

		Parents	
		N	%
a.	professional	30	61.22
b.	managerial occupation	3	6.12
c.	white collar worker	13	26.53
d.	skill or tradesman	1	2.04
e.	unskilled worker	2	4.08

What do you think she will really do if she finishes high school?

		Parents	
		N	%
a.	professional	17	50.00
b.	managerial occupation	4	11.76
c.	white collar worker	11	32.35
d.	skill or tradesman	2	5.88
e.	unskilled	-	-
f.	armed service	-	-

What do you think might keep your son or daughter from doing the work which you would most like him or her to do? (Check all appropriate)

		Parents			
		Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a.	nothing special; excellent chances	17	22.37	58	76.32
b.	not enough ability	8	10.53	68	89.47
c.	not enough money	28	36.84	48	63.16
d.	not good enough in (his or her studies)	3	4.00	72	96.00
e.	fear of failure	3	4.00	72	96.00
f.	too little help from the family	5	6.67	70	93.33
g.	feeling that he or she does not have as good a chance as others	3	4.00	72	96.00

		Parents		
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
h. sickness	7	9.33	68	90.67
i. he or she would rather get a job	1	1.33	74	98.67
j. some other reason	5	6.67	70	93.33

What do you think might keep you from doing the work which you would most like to do? (Check all appropriate)

		Students		
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. nothing special; excellent chances	20	20.0	80	80.0
b. not enough ability	16	16.1	84	84.0
c. not enough money	24	24.0	76	76.0
d. not good enough in (his or her) studies	15	15.0	85	85.0
e. fear of failure	21	21.0	79	79.0
f. too little help from the family	7	7.0	93	93.0
g. feeling that he or she does not have as good a chance as others	14	14.0	86	86.0
h. sickness	6	6.0	94	94.0
i. he or she would rather get a job	8	8.0	92	92.0
j. some other reason	6	6.0	94	94.0

What do you think your child should do about school?

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
a. drop out and get a job	-	-	1	1.01
b. finish high school	6	8.11	14	14.14
c. finish high school and get a job	10	13.51	31	31.31
d. go to college	14	18.92	14	14.14
e. finish college and get a job	44	59.46	39	39.39

How many years of education do you think your child should have?

a. the same as you had	-	-	34	35.05
b. less than you had	1	1.37	6	6.19
c. more than you had	69	98.63	57	58.76

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
Do you think your daughters should try to get as much education as your sons do?				
a. yes	60	86.96	83	83.0
b. no	9	13.04	17	17.0

What do you think your child should get out of his education? (Check all appropriate)

	Parents			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. learn to read, write, add, spell, and speak English	14	18.67	61	81.33
b. learn a special trade	12	16.00	63	84.00
c. learn to get along with people	11	14.67	64	85.33
d. all of the above	43	57.33	32	42.67
e. other (explain)	7	9.33	68	90.67

	Students			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. learn to read, write, add, spell, and speak English	33	33.0	67	67.0
b. learn a special trade	10	10.0	90	90.0
c. learn to get along with people	18	18.0	82	82.0
d. all of the above	62	62.0	38	38.0
e. other (explain)	2	2.0	98	98.0

Do you think your daughters should try to get as much education as your sons do?

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
a. yes	60	86.96	83	83.0
b. no	9	13.04	17	17.0

If answer is No, why? (Check all appropriate)

	Parents			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. girls belong in the home to learn housework	2	2.70	72	97.30
b. girls are not as smart as boys	4	5.41	70	94.59
c. girls do not need an education	6	8.11	68	91.89

	Students			
	Checked	%	Not Checked	%
a. girls belong in the home to learn housework	18	18.56	79	81.44
b. girls are not as smart as boys	6	6.19	91	93.81
c. girls do not need an education	2	2.06	95	97.94

Has a member of your immediate family (Check all appropriate)

	Parents			
a. dropped out of school before high school	21	28.00	54	72.00
b. finished high school	30	40.00	45	60.00
c. dropped out of high school	14	18.67	61	81.33
d. entered college	10	13.33	65	86.67
e. finished college	8	10.67	67	89.33

	Students			
a. dropped out of school before high school	24	24.24	75	75.76
b. finished high school	41	41.41	58	58.59
c. dropped out of high school	16	16.16	83	83.84
d. entered college	22	22.22	77	77.78
e. finished college	16	16.16	83	83.84

	Parents		Students	
	N	%	N	%
Do you think your children should get as much education as they can?				
a. yes	68	93.15	96	96.0
b. no	5	6.85	4	4.0

	Students Only	
	N	%
Do you speak both English and Spanish?		
a. yes	97	97.0
b. no	3	3.0
What language did you learn to speak first?		
a. Spanish	67	67.0
b. English	16	16.0
c. Both	17	17.0
Do you think Headstart will help students like yourself?		
a. yes	78	79.5
b. no	6	6.1
c. I don't know	3	14.2
Would you rather have a male or female teacher?		
a. male	7	7.1
b. female	22	22.4
c. makes no difference	69	70.4
Would you rather have a Mexican-American, Negro or Anglo teacher?		
a. Negro	0	0.0
b. Mexican American	22	22.4
c. Anglo	6	6.1
d. Other	0	0.0
e. Makes no difference	70	71.4
What would you most like to do as a life work?		
a. professional	48	48.9
b. managerial occupation	11	11.2
c. white collar	22	22.4
d. skill or tradesman	16	16.3
e. unskilled worker	1	1.0
What do you think you will really do if you finish high school?		
a. professional	40	41.6
b. managerial occupation	4	4.1
c. white collar worker	20	20.8
d. skill or tradesman	12	12.5
e. unskilled	4	4.1
f. armed service	16	16.6

FREQUENCY CODE

	Husband		Wife		Both		Neither-husband might		Neither-wife might		Neither-both might		Don't know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Painting rooms in the house?														
Parents	21	28.77	17	23.29	32	43.84			3	4.11				
Students	36	38.30	10	10.64	36	38.30	1	1.06	1	1.06	1	1.06	9	9.57
2. Getting up at night to take care of the children if they cry?														
Parents	2	2.70	53	71.62	18	24.32							1	1.35
Students	2	2.25	59	66.29	21	23.60	1	1.12	1	1.12	3	3.37	3	3.37
3. Deciding where to go for a holiday or celebration?														
Parents	17	23.29	25	34.25	27	36.99					2	2.74	2	2.74
Students	14	15.05	15	16.13	53	56.99	1	1.08	1	1.08	2	2.15	7	7.53
4. Punishing the children if necessary?														
Parents	10	13.51	29	39.19	34	45.95					1	1.35		
Students	28	29.79	21	22.34	41	43.62							4	4.26

	Husband		Wife		Both		Neither-husband might		Neither-wife might		Neither-both might		Don't know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Picking out more expensive things like furniture or a car?														
Parents	8	10.96	24	34.88	38	52.05					1	1.37	2	2.74
Students	19	20.00	23	24.21	34	35.79	1	1.05			6	6.32	12	12.63
6. Taking care of the children when they are sick?														
Parents	5	6.76	45	60.81	23	31.08					1	1.35		
Students	1	1.04	52	54.17	38	39.58			1	1.04	2	2.08	2	2.08
7. Making the payments or handles the finances?														
Parents	19	25.68	32	43.24	23	31.08								
Students	27	23.84	39	40.21	29	29.90					1	1.03	1	1.03
8. Buying the groceries?														
Parents	6	8.00	49	65.33	20	26.67								
Students	9	9.18	56	57.14	29	29.59	1	1.02	2	2.04	1	1.02		
9. Washes the clothes?														
Parents	4	5.26	64	84.21	7	9.21							1	1.32
Students			83	85.57	11	11.34			2	2.06			1	1.03

	Husband		Wife		Both		Neither-husband might		Neither-wife might		Neither-both might		Don't know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10. Goes to P.T.A. meetings?														
Parents	5	6.76	37	50.00	23	31.08	1	1.35	4	5.41	3	4.05	1	1.35
Students	2	2.06	42	43.30	32	32.99	2	2.06	2	2.06				
11. Managing the social affairs engaged in by the family?														
Parents	14	19.44	27	37.50	28	38.88					1	1.39	2	2.78
Students			73	75.26	13	13.40	1	1.03			6	6.19	4	4.12
12. Taking care of the children every day?														
Parents	3	4.05	59	74.73	11	14.86							1	1.35
Students			87	89.69	8	8.25			1	1.03			1	1.03
13. Does cooking?														
Parents	3	4.00	66	88.00	5	6.67							1	1.33
Students			87	89.69	8	8.25					1	1.03		
14. Does yard work?														
Parents	38	52.05	8	15.9	24	32.88								
Students	58	62.37	7	7.53	16	17.20			3	3.23			9	9.68

Parents' form only:
Income: Monthly______ Weekly______

	N	%
0-$3000/year	19	30.65
$3500-$5000/year	20	32.65
$5000 and above	23	37.10

Chapter IV

FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will present results of the analysis and the implications to education. Obviously these empirical results and inferences must be made on the basis of the few statistically significant findings which might have occurred by chance, the methodology, and the sample selection. This statement is not to minimize the findings but to add a word of discretion when one is examining them. From this frame of reference the findings will be examined for indicators, indices, and patterns for possible educational implications and other researchable questions. The results will be related to the "Cultural Deprivation" theory introduced in Chapter I by discussing the two general basic questions: (1) Does the low socioeconomic Mexican American perceive himself as disclosed in the literature? (2) Are there relationships between educational achievement, perceived cultural characteristics, and the seven specific themes, 1) Ethnic Isolation, 2) Spanish Language, 3) Fatalism, 4) Present Day Orientation, 5) Limited Aspiration, 6) Machismo, and 7) Family Solidarity, which are within the same theoretical system.

PERCEPTION OF CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

Before one can understand the Mexican American's view on education, one must know the Mexican American's frame of reference. That is, one must have a relative idea of how the Mexican American perceives himself. It was with this purpose in mind that the seven characteristics were selected as reference points and not to engage in theoretical debate.

The results seemed to indicate that the Mexican American cultural characteristics as perceived by the members of 100 low socioeconomic Mexican American families were not in total accordance with the literature. There appeared to be general agreement on the themes of ethnic isolation, Spanish language, family solidarity, and, to some extent, present day orientation, while there seemed to be general disagreement in the areas of fatalism, limited aspirations, and Machismo. The findings disclosed the Mexican American as living in isolation, maintaining the Spanish language, and having strong family ties. He was also disclosed to a certain degree as being prone to function in terms of the present as opposed to the past or the future, as being non-fatalistic, as having high aspirations and not adhering to the Machismo concept. A more detailed discussion on each theme will follow.

Relationship Between Perceived Cultural Characteristics and Educational Achievement

It has been proposed in the literature and in the field that there is an association between the Mexican American culture and educational achievement. Thus this discussion deals with the existence and nature of this relationship. These findings hopefully will add to a better understanding of the Mexican American's perception on education which in turn will provide a better basis for developing educational programs.

The general results appeared to indicate that there was little or no relationship between the characteristics and scholastic achievement. There was some indication of association between educational achievement and Spanish language, fatalism, present day orientation, limited aspiration, and *Machismo*. Each relationship will be discussed in the following seven specific themes. In several instances the educational implications will be the same due to the interrelatedness of the themes.

Ethnic isolation. With educational issues such as pairing Mexican American students with black students, bussing students from one end of town to another, maintaining the neighborhood school concept, and renovating schools in old neighborhoods, the ethnic isolation theme becomes a very important dimension to consider in today's educational planning.

The majority of the Mexican American families indicated that they had lived in the same neighborhood for a long time and would probably stay there because it was close to their work, and they had relatives and friends there. Sixty percent indicated they had lived 7 years or longer in that neighborhood. Eighty-eight percent said they would not move within 12 months. If they moved 90 percent said they would remain in Corpus Christi, Texas. If they moved away from the city, 97 percent stated that they would stay in Texas. The main reason given for moving to that particular neighborhood was that it was close to their work. The second most often checked response was because they had relatives living there. Only a few people indicated that they could not afford to "rent anywhere else in town." Most of these families lived within walking distance of each other and kept in close contact. Sixty percent talked with other families at least once a week. When separated by sex there appeared to be more relatives living close by on the female's side. One explanation could be that the male marries and lives with his in-laws or close by. The summary scores showed the boys more isolated than the girls. The analysis of variance between parents and children indicated parents were more isolation prone. This could be a reflection on the age and educational difference of both groups.

Since the living pattern of the low socioeconomic Mexican American is one of concentration with little mobilization within cities, school districts should see that these schools are staffed with personnel who are sensitive to the needs of the Mexican American child. The administration, instruction and facilities should be just as good as anywhere else in that school district. Each school should have some type of vehicle with which to assess the needs, concerns, and priorities of its own neighborhood in order to get a better understanding of the child from the barrio.

Spanish language. The Spanish language has been a cultural bond as well as a means for communication for the Mexican American. A majority of educators view the Spanish language as a barrier to the educational advancement of the Mexican American child in an English-speaking school system. This investigation will focus on the usage and comprehension of the Spanish language in relation to the English language by parents and students.

The general results disclosed parents more versed in the Spanish language, students more versed in the English language, and both groups believing in bilingual education.

Parents spoke and understood Spanish better than the students. Over 95 percent of the parents and students indicated they spoke Spanish. However, the parents perceived themselves speaking Spanish better than their children. On the other hand, 95 percent of the children could speak both English and Spanish. Fifty-four percent of the students responded that they could understand both languages equally well, 34 percent said they could understand English better and only 12 percent stated that they could understand Spanish better.

Parents read and understood Spanish better than the students. Seventy-one percent of the parents reported that they read Spanish while only 58 percent of the students reported that they did. The parents also viewed themselves as reading better than the children.

The findings disclosed 72 percent of the parents could write in Spanish as opposed to 54 percent of the students. The results also showed the parents writing better than the students.

The results indicated parents had fewer problems understanding radio programs in Spanish and Mexican movies than the ninth grade students. Seventy-eight percent of the parents listened to radio programs from Mexico as compared to 30 percent of the children. The majority of parents and children reported having little difficulty in understanding the radio shows. Seventy-eight percent of the parents and 86 percent of the children reported going to Mexican movies. However, the students reported a greater number of problems in understanding them than the parents did. Chi square computation indicated low achieving students did not go to Mexican movies.

The home is seen as fostering the Spanish language. Only 27 percent of the parents and 51 percent of the students spoke English before the first grade. Although parents reported 95 percent of their children spoke English and Spanish, 58 percent of the children learned Spanish first. About half of the parents and students indicated that the ninth grade students understood both languages equally well. Forty-two percent of the parents and 34 percent of the students indicated the ninth grade students as understanding English better. The language most frequently used at home is either "both English and Spanish" or "mostly Spanish." Sixty percent of the parents said they spoke both languages at home. Twenty-nine percent said mostly Spanish; 7 percent stated only Spanish and 3 percent mostly English. The children reported 37 percent speaking both English and Spanish; 37 percent mostly Spanish; 15 percent only Spanish; 9 percent mostly Spanish; and 2 percent only English.

The analysis of variance between parents' and students' Spanish summary scores indicated significant differences. This could be explained largely by the nine years of formal schooling that the students have received as compared to the lower level of schooling of their parents. Research also has indicated that after the fifth grade the English language becomes dominant. Fifty-one percent of the students indicated that they spoke English before school as compared to 27 percent of the parents. Ninety-six percent of the students reported speaking English as compared to 86 percent of the parents. Ninety-nine percent of the children could write in English as compared to 80 percent of their parents.

The majority of parents and students believed in bilingual education. In item 33: If your child speaks and understands both languages, do you think it is important for him to learn to read and write in Spanish as well as in English, 99 percent of the parents and 92 percent of the students marked yes. In item 35: Do you think Bilingual Education will help your children more than just teaching them in one language, 88 percent of the parents said yes, 8 percent said no, 4 percent said they did not know. Fifty-four percent of the students said yes, 46 percent said they did not know. When sex is used as the discriminating index, the girl students said yes and the boy students said they did not know. These students had little experience with a bilingual program. On the other hand, 80 percent of the students said yes, 6 percent said no, and 14 percent said, I do not know, to the question: Do you think Headstart will help students like yourself? The majority of these students had participated in Headstart. There was a relationship between high educational achievers and the yes response. This could mean that the high achievers were already motivated, or that Headstart had a positive effect, or both.

There are several educational implications in these findings. First there is a tremendous need for more personnel at all levels who speak and understand Spanish in schools which serve predominantly Mexican American neighborhoods.

Second, communications from the school to the home should be in Spanish as well as English whenever possible. Personal contact with the parents should be made by a bilingual person. Written communications should be in Spanish as well as English. These schools should use the newspaper printed in Spanish, Spanish speaking radio and television programs to discuss activities, problems, related to their particular schools.

Third, these schools should assess their community for the possibility of using a Spanish or a bilingual approach to increase the parent participation. The use of Spanish as well as English increases the probability for better communication and decreases the credibility gap between the schools and the Mexican American community.

Fourth, since most of these students are bilingual to an extent and their parents view bilingual as beneficial, more and better bilingual programs need to be planned with the regular school program. Finally, more and better year-round early childhood and Headstart programs should be developed for the Mexican American children.

Fatalism. The low socioeconomic Mexican American has been displayed in the literature and reported in the field as being fatalistic in nature. The findings indicated that the Mexican Americans were not in accordance with the literature.

Both parents and students generally believed in themselves, school, and hard work for success. Over 80 percent of the parents and over 90 percent of the students were not in accord with this item: People like me who are born poor will be poor all their lives. On the item: People like me do not have much of a chance to be successful in life, 64 percent of the parents and 76 percent of the students disagreed. Seventy-one percent of the parents and 59 percent of the students also disagreed on the item: Planning my future ahead of time is a waste of time because I cannot alter my future. On the item: Everytime I try to get ahead, something or someone stops me, 66 percent of the parents disagreed while only 48 percent of the students disagreed. This item appear to be more realistic in nature rather than fatalistic. Another assumption is that the student is controlled by parental and school authorities. This could be one of the reasons for answering the following items the way they did. Sixty-one percent of the students agreed that: People like me should not expect too much of life so that I will not be disappointed, while only 38 percent of the parents agreed. More than 80 percent of parents and students agreed that doing school work would make the future easier. Over 80 percent of the parents and over 90 percent of the children disagreed on the following item: School will not help my children in the future. The same percent of parents and students disagreed on this item: School will not help my children get a better job. Over 70 percent of the parents and over 80 percent of the students agreed that hard work was more important than good luck for success. The chi square computation indicated some association with the low educational achievers and item: Good luck is more important than hard work for success. This could be an attempt on the part of these students to remove the blame away from themselves.

The analysis of variance between parents' and students' summary fatalistic scores showed no difference.

There appear to be three general educational implications:

1. Educators should believe in Mexican American students and parents for self improvement. Since the Mexican American already believes in himself, this will reinforce the self-fulfilling prophecy.

2. The Mexican American sees the value of school as a means for a better job and an easier future. This attitude would imply that there should be better attendance, study habits, and more cooperation from parents. In reality the opposite is true. Then it follows that the economic aspect should be examined for possibly more work-study programs, free lunch programs without any stigma attached, more "how to help students programs" for parents.

3. These people believe in hard work for success. More and better educational programs are needed in these schools using parents from the barrios as aides. This would have a tremendous impact. There would be some income in that family, perhaps preventing some seventeen-year-old Mexican American youngsters from dropping out of school to go to work. Also, that parent could understand the school function better and relate it to the other people of the community.

Present day orientation. The lower socioeconomic Mexican American is portrayed as focusing on the present rather than the future. The findings are in accordance to a large extent with the literature.

The results indicated that parents and students were proven to be present day oriented as opposed to future and past oriented. In one question the majority of parents chose the future way of looking at life. In another item parents chose the future way and the students the present way. Finally on another item both parents and students chose the present. The chi square computation indicated a relationship between the medium educational achievement and present day orientation. The analysis of variance between parents and students disclosed that the students were more present day oriented.

The educational implications would be to have short range objectives in the instruction of these children.

Instruction should begin with the concrete and work toward the abstract with several reinforcement strategies. Careful steps should be outlined to obtain immediate reinforcement in order for every student to succeed at his own rate of speed.

Limited aspirations. Educators generally believe that a self-motivated student is easier to teach than a child who has to be motivated. They also believe that a relatively high level of aspiration will increase the probability for success in school as well as in life. This discussion will deal with the aspiration level of the impoverished Mexican American.

The general results indicated that the Mexican American has a high level of aspiration for employment and education. On the item: What would you most like your ninth grade son to do as a life work, over 52 percent of the parents chose professional work, 8 percent chose managerial work, 15 percent chose white collar, 19 percent chose a skilled work and only 6 percent chose unskilled work. Then, when the item was presented a little differently, the responses held to a large degree. The item read: What do you think he will really do if he finishes high school? Forty-two percent of the parents said professional, 7 percent said managerial, 16 percent said white collar, 25 percent said skilled or tradesman, 4 percent said unskilled and 7 percent said the armed services.

The responses were similar when the same two questions were asked about their ninth grade daughter. Over 60 percent of the parents wanted their daughters to go into a profession, 6 percent indicated some type of managerial occupation, 27 percent wanted some type of white collar job. Two percent chose skilled labor and 4 percent chose unskilled labor. On the second item, 50 percent of the parents chose professional, 12 percent checked managerial, 32 said white collar, and only 6 percent said skilled or tradesman.

The parents' responses on these two items were in accordance with the students' choices. On the first question 49 percent of the students checked professional, 11 percent checked managerial, 22 percent checked white collar, 16 percent checked skilled or tradesman, and only 1 percent checked unskilled work. On the second question, What do you think you will really do if you finish high school, the percentages were slightly lower as were the parents. This time only 42 percent chose professional work, 4 percent chose managerial work, 21 percent chose white collar work, 13 percent chose skilled work or tradesman, 4 percent chose unskilled work and 17 percent chose the armed service as their answer.

Both parents and students indicated they should get as much education as they could. The majority of the parents indicated that students should learn to read, write, add, and spell; speak English; learn a trade; and learn to get along with people. This response is in contrast to the literature which states parents send their children to school to learn "how to behave." Both groups indicated their children should get more education than their parents had. On the other hand, the chi square analysis showed the low educational achievers stating that their children should have less education than they had. Over 80 percent of the parents and students indicated girls should try to get as much education as boys. The high educational achievers felt that the girls should get an education and not just stay home to learn housework. These families had a dropout background. Thirty-five percent of the parents and 40 percent of the students indicated a member of the immediate family had dropped out of school.

The level of aspiration appears to be related to the economic factor. This was clearly pointed out when the neighborhood council met and listed first, more jobs for the teenagers, and second, a four-year state supported college as their priorities for the seventies. Then it follows that more work-study programs should be implemented and more scholarships be awarded. A high school scholarship fund should be started by private and civic groups. There is reason to believe some junior high school students do not have the money to buy lunch or have "nice clothes" so they drop out to seek employment.

Parents and students agree on the value of education. Parents and students should not be told how to succeed in school but should be shown. Parents should be shown how they can help their children at home by assigning a certain area for studying or by turning off the radio and/or the television set for an hour or so. Students should be shown how to assemble all their study materials and budget their time to fit the needs of each course. These suggestions may sound elementary to someone coming from a middle class home but they cannot be taken for granted with the lower socioeconomic Mexican American student.

Machismo. The male in the low socioeconomic Mexican American family is seen as having superior intelligence and having a definite manly role according to the literature. He is allowed more privileges than the women.

The results on the Machismo concept items indicated that the parents and students were not in agreement with the literature. Over 70 percent of the parents and over 80 percent of the students disagreed that men are always smarter than women. Over half of the parents and students disagreed that men can do anything they want to do but the women should not. When the students were separated by sequence, the low achievers thought men could do anything they wanted but the women should not. The majority of parents and students agreed that women cannot always do what they want. This could be a reflection on the total society and not just on the Mexican American family. On the item, Would you rather have a male or female teacher?, only 7 percent said male, 22 percent said female, and 70 percent said it did not make any difference. The chi square analysis indicated an association between female teachers and medium achievers.

On the next question: Would you rather have a Mexican American, Negro, or Anglo teacher?, none chose the Negro, 22 percent chose Mexican American, 6 percent chose the Anglo, and 71 percent said it did not make any difference. The analysis of variance between the parents and students Machismo disclosed a difference. This could be explained in terms of the age and educational difference between years. The average age of the students is about 14 years with the parents average age being 35 years old. The children are ninth grade students while the parents had gone on the average only to the sixth grade.

The educational implications appear to be that the sex does not really matter as far as the student is concerned, although there is an indication of favoring the female teachers. This could be the result of having female teachers most of the time. Another implication is that the ethnicity of the teacher does not matter as far as the student is concerned. The implication here is that these children should have the best qualified and certified teacher regardless of sex or ethnic background. If these people happen to be Mexican Americans who are sensitive to the needs of these students, so much the better.

Family solidarity. In our changing society the most important basic unit is still the family. Technology and urbanization has modified the role of the family as well as its members. The Mexican American family has been reported to be a close knit unit with definite male and female roles. This will be an examination of the Mexican Americans' view on the man's and woman's function in the Mexican American family of today.

The results indicate different viewpoints when one compares the literature and both parents' and students' responses, and when one compares the sexes of the parents. The findings also appeared to indicate that there were certain roles for the male, certain roles for the female and there were functions where they both participated.

In general both parents and students agreed that the family was more important than the individual. On the item: Your family is more important than you, 97 percent of the parents and 74 percent of the students agreed.

The results showed the chore most often checked by the Mexican American male was the yardwork. The other chores were done by the wife or by both. Chores done most often by the wife included getting up at night to take care of the children when they were sick, making payments, buying groceries, washing clothes, going to P.T.A. and cooking. Things being done by both included painting rooms in the house, deciding where to go on a holiday, punishing the children if necessary, choosing expensive things like furniture or a car, and managing the social affairs.

When an analysis of variance was computed between students and parents on the Family Solidarity items, there was a significant difference on their perceptions. The students had more clearly defined roles for the parents than the parents indicated. This is a case of what people really do or what people think they do or should do. This phenomenon was also evident when sex was used as the discriminating factor. The male and female views were different. Here again is the case of having different perceptions of the male and female role in the family.

The educational implications on these results are that the school should contact and gain the support of the father. The findings show the mother or both attending the P.T.A. meetings but with very little participation from the father. Both parents should be contacted in case of a discipline problem. Too many times the contact is only with the mother. It appears that the mother is involved more with the bringing up of the children. This indicates that the Mexican American family is really not different from the dominant culture family. This is due to the other dominant culture institutions such as economics, politics, science and education which have modified the life style of the Mexican American family.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will present a summary and recommendations and conclusions based on the findings of this study.

PROBLEM

The specific purpose of this study was to investigate two general basic questions: (1) Does the low socioeconomic Mexican American perceive himself as disclosed in the literature? (2) Are there relationships between educational achievement, perceived Cultural Characteristics and the seven specific themes: 1) Ethnic Isolation, 2) Spanish Language, 3) Fatalism, 4) Present Day Orientation, 5) Limited Aspirations, 6) *Machismo*, and 7) Family Solidarity?

PROCEDURE

Instruments

Two questionnaires were developed by this investigator for use with ninth grade students and parents in the Corpus Christi Independent School District. The one for the parents was translated into Spanish for persons who did not speak or understand English. The questions yielded information on the following cultural characteristics: (1) Ethnic

Isolation, (2) Spanish Language, (3) Fatalism, (4) Present Day Orientation, (5) Limited Aspirations, (6) Machismo, and (7) Family Solidarity.

Validity

The validity evaluation of both questionnaires was made by a five-member panel of experts who have done work in the field of Mexican American education. These educators have served as local, state, and national consultants in the field of educating the Mexican American student. The five members were as follows: (1) Mr. Alonso Perales, Curriculum Director, San Antonio Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas; (2) Mr. Gonzalo Garza, Area V Superintendent, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas; (3) Mr. Carlos Rivera, Assistant Superintendent for Mexican American Education, El Paso Independent School District, El Paso, Texas; (4) Mr. Salvador Alvarez, Foreign Language Consultant, Corpus Christi Independent School District, Corpus Christi, Texas; and (5) Dr. Josephine Sobrino, Professor, Spanish Department, University of Houston, Houston, Texas. Dr. Sobrino and Mr. Alvarez assisted in translating the questionnaire into Spanish so that persons in the barrios would have a better understanding of the instrument.

Reliability

The instruments were tested for reliability using the test-retest method. The questionnaires were administered to 30 Edison Junior High ninth graders and 60 parents in the

Magnolia area in Houston, Texas. Magnolia was selected because it was very similar to the Zavala area in Corpus Christi.

Informants

The use of local bilingual interviewers became of vital importance while doing research in the Mexican American *barrios*. First there was the language factor. Second there was the inherited factor of suspicion of an outsider. Interviewers from the *barrios* established rapport quicker and gained the confidence of the respondent which was needed for an effective study.

Sample Area

Corpus Christi with a population of 201,548 was chosen as the site for the study. Mexican Americans made up approximately forty-nine percent of the total population. There were several reasons for selecting the Zavala neighborhood in Corpus Christi, Texas. First, it has been one of the oldest Mexican American neighborhoods in Corpus Christi. Second, it had well-defined boundaries which included Highway 44 and three major streets (Part, Baldwin, and Morgan). Third it was primarily a residential area located in the west part of town. Fourth, the area was relatively isolated from downtown, major suburbs, and the greater community. Fifth, the median educational level for persons 25 years and over was reported at the 3.7 grade on the 1960 census. Sixth, this area has been defined by the local OEO Community Action office and by the school district as a low socioeconomic area with a median income of $3,031 per family.

Method

One hundred Mexican American ninth graders were randomly selected from over two hundred Ella Barnes Junior High School Mexican American students. Each selected student was given two letters, one in English and the other in Spanish explaining the study to the parents. This investigator administered the questionnaire to the students and the parents of the selected students were interviewed by 4 two-member teams; one interviewer asked questions while the other recorded responses.

FINDINGS

Descriptive Analysis

Students. A total of 100 ninth grade students were administered the instrument. Of these students 55 were male and 45 were female. Of this population, 31 were classified as high, 42 as medium, and 27 as low educational achievers. This classification was determined by their placement in English and mathematics sequence. These students were placed in either sequence 1 (enriched), sequence 2 (standard), or sequence 3 (basic) based upon their school grades, achievement scores, recommendations of their teachers, counselors, and parent consent.

Parents. Seventy-six parents were interviewed. Out of these parents, 21 were male and 55 were female. Out of this population, 53 percent had some elementary education, 40 percent had some junior or senior high school education and 7 percent had graduated from high school or had some college education. Sixty-three percent of the parents earned $3,000 or less per year while 37 percent earned between $3,500 and $5,000 per year.

Analysis of Relationships

Relationship between students' perception of cultural characteristics and educational achievement. The chi square test of significance was computed and disclosed only 10 significant relationships out of 116 possibilities, which might be attributed to chance. The 10 relationships were: 2 significant relationships out of a possible 26 from the Spanish category; 1 out of 9 from the Fatalism theme, 1 out of 4 possibilities from the Present Day Orientation; 2 out of 28 possibilities from Limited Aspirations, 3 out of 18 Machismo items, and 1 from the 15 Family Solidarity items.

Relationship between students' perception of cultural characteristics and sex. The data were analyzed by means of chi square. The results showed only 12 statistically significant relationships out of 116 computations. The 12 significant relationships were as follows: 1 from 25 Ethnic items, 2 from the Spanish Language category, 5 from the Limited Aspirations theme, 3 from the *Machismo* category and 1 from 16 Family Solidarity items.

Relationship between parents' perception of cultural characteristics and educational level. The chi square test of significance revealed only 7 significant relationships out of 121 possibilities. The 7 were: 2 from the Ethnic Isolation group, 3 from the Spanish Language theme, 1 from the Limited Aspirations items and 1 from the Family Solidarity group.

Relationship between parents' perception of cultural characteristics and sex. The chi square test of significance disclosed 13 significant relationships out of 121 computations. The significant relationships were: 1 from the Ethnic Isolation theme, 6 from the *Machismo* group, and 6 from the Family Solidarity items.

Relationship between parents' perception of cultural characteristics and income. This data when analyzed by means of chi square disclosed nine statistically significant out of 121 possibilities. The nine relationships were: 1 from the Ethnic Isolation group, 1 from the Spanish Language theme, 1 from the Fatalism theme, 1 from the Limited Aspirations category, 2 from the *Machismo* theme, and 2 from the Family Solidarity items.

Analysis of Variance

The analysis of variance was computed to investigate differences in the data. The analysis of variance results included the following:

Parents and students. The analysis of variance between students' and parents' perceived cultural characteristics summary index disclosed:

(1) Parents were more isolated than students.

(2) Parents were more prone to the Spanish language than the students.

(3) There were no differences between parents and students on their fatalism perception.

(4) The students were more present day oriented than the parents.

(5) There was no difference between parents' and students' views on the limited aspiration theme.

(6) The students were more prone to the Machismo concept than the parents.

(7) The students were more oriented toward the family solidarity theme than the parents.

Students' educational achievement and perceived cultural characteristics. The analysis of variance between the students' perception of Cultural Characteristics and educational achievement showed no significant differences.

Students' sex and perceived cultural characteristics. The analysis of variance between the students' sex and perceived cultural characteristics resulted in the boys being more isolated than the girls.

Parents' educational level and perceived cultural characteristics. The analysis of variance between the parents' educational level and perceived Cultural Characteristics revealed no significant differences.

Parents' sex and perceived cultural characteristics. The analysis of variance between the parents' sex and the perceived Cultural Characteristics disclosed the male perceived himself more egalitarian than the female viewed him.

Parents' income and perceived cultural characteristics. The analysis of variance between the parents' income and their perceived Cultural Characteristics disclosed no significant differences.

The results indicated that the Mexican American cultural characteristics as perceived by the members of 100 low socioeconomic Mexican American families are not in total accordance with the literature. There is general agreement on the themes of Ethnic Isolation, Spanish Language, Family Solidarity, and to some extent, Present Day Orientation, while there seems to be general disagreement in the areas of Fatalism, Limited Aspirations, and *Machismo*. The findings disclose the Mexican American as living in isolation, maintaining the Spanish language, and having strong family ties. He is also disclosed to a certain degree as being prone to function in terms of the present as opposed to the past or the future, as being non-fatalistic, as having high aspirations and not adhering to the Machismo concept.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Ethnic Isolation

Since the living pattern of the low socioeconomic Mexican American is one of concentration with little mobilization within cities, school districts should see that these schools are staffed with personnel who are sensitive to the needs of the Mexican American child. The administration, instruction, and facilities should be just as good as anywhere else in that school district. Each school should have some type of vehicle with which to assess the needs, concerns, and priorities of its own neighborhood in order to get a better understanding of the child from the barrio.

Spanish Language

First, there is a tremendous need for more personnel at all levels who speak and understand Spanish in schools which serve predominantly Mexican American neighborhoods.

Second, communication from the school to the home should be in Spanish as well as English whenever possible.

Personal contact with the parents should be made by a bilingual person whenever possible. Written communication should be in Spanish as well as English. These schools should use the newspaper printed in Spanish, the Spanish speaking radio and television programs to discuss activities and problems related to their particular schools.

Third, these schools should assess their community for the possibility of using a Spanish or a bilingual approach to increase their parent involvement. The use of Spanish as well as English increases the probability for better communications and decreases the credibility gap between the schools and the Mexican American community.

Fourth, since most of these students are bilingual to an extent and their parents view bilingualism as beneficial, more and better bilingual programs should be implemented with the regular school program.

Finally, more and better year-round early childhood and Headstart programs should be developed for the Mexican American children since research has pointed out the importance of preschool education.

Fatalism

Educators should believe in the Mexican American student since he believes in himself. Educators should have more work-study programs to keep the Mexican American from dropping out to get a job. More parents are needed in the schools to work as aides.

Present Day Orientation

Programs with more personalized and individualized short range objectives should be used in the instruction of the low socioeconomic Mexican American student. Careful steps should be outlined to obtain immediate reinforcement in order to succeed.

Limited Aspirations

More federal funds should be used to create jobs for low socioeconomic students. More scholarships should be granted by civic organizations not only to college-bound students but some aid should be given to high school students. This financial aid would prevent some students from dropping out of school to go to work.

Machismo

The sex or ethnic background of the teacher should not matter as long as he is qualified and is sensitive to the needs of the Mexican American students.

Family Solidarity

The school should be a focal point of the community to gain the support of the father as well as the mother.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Based upon findings of this study additional studies are recommended:

1. The investigation of the effect of Headstart on the educational achievement of the Mexican American child.
2. Determination of the effect of bilingual education on the educational achievement of the Mexican American student.
3. The investigation of the effect of ability grouping on the educational achievement on the Mexican American child.

The answer to many of the problems of the Mexican American rests within the educational arena. The problems which exist for the Mexican American student many times go beyond the realm of the classroom. There must be an awareness, a commitment, and an urgent positive action in the social, political, and economical arena so that the "impossible dream" may become a reality for more Mexican American children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Father in Texas, "The Community Speaks," *The National Elementary Principal*, Vol. I, No. 2, November, 1970, pp. 32-33.

Altus, William D. "The American Mexican: The Survival of a Culture," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1939, Vol. 29, pp. 211-220.

Arias, Antonio, Consultant, Attendance Department, Houston Independent School District. Personal interview, February 11, 1972.

Arizona State University, College of Education, *Investigation of Mental Retardation and Pseudo Mental Retardation to Bilingual and Sub-Cultural Factors*. Financed under contract with the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Tempe, Arizona, 1960.

Ballesteros, David. "Toward an Advantaged Society: Bilingual Education in the 70's," *The National Elementary Principal*, Vol. I., No. 2, November, 1970, pp. 25-28.

Bogardus, Emory S. "Gangs of Mexican-American Youth," *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. II., No. 3, September, 1963, pp. 21-29.

Browning, Harley L. and S. Dale McLemore. *A Statistical Population of Texas*. Austin: The University of Texas, 1964.

Bruning, James and B. L. Kintz. *Computational Handbook of Statistics*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1968.

Carlson, Hilding B. and Norman Henderson. "The Intelligence of American Children of Mexican Parentage," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. II, No. 2, July, 1950, pp. 31-36.

Carter, Thomas P. *Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Casavantes, Edward. "Pride and Prejudice: A Mexican American Dilemma," *Civil Rights Digest*, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Vol. III, No. 1, Winter, 1970, pp. 22-27.

Casso, Father Henry J. "Ya Basta, The Siesta is Over," in Johnson, H. S. and William J. Hernandez, Educating the Mexican American. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1970, pp. 93-99.

Ceja, Manuel. "Method of Orientation of Spanish-Speaking Children to an American School." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Southern California, 1957.

Cisneros vs. Corpus Christi School District (Civil Action No. 68-C-95, 1970).

Clark, Margaret. Health in the Mexican-American Culture. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.

Colorado State Department of Education, "The Public Schools and Spanish Speaking Children," A Research Contribution for Education in Colorado, Vol. III, No. 3, January, 1967.

Corona, Bert C. "A Study of Adjustment and Interpersonal Relations of Adolescents of Mexican Descent." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1955.

Delgado vs. The Bastrop Independent School District (Civil Action No. 338, W. D. Texas, June 15, 1948).

Felder, Dell. "The Education of Mexican-Americans: Falacies of the Monoculture Approach," Social Education, Vol. 34, No. 6, October, 1970, pp. 639-642.

Forbes, Jack D. Mexican Americans: A Handbook for Educators (1966), The Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Francesca, Sister Mary. "Variations of Selected Cultural Patterns Among Three Generations of Mexicans in San Antonio, Texas," The American Catholic Sociological Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, March, 1958, pp. 298-301.

Galarza, Ernesto, Herman Gallegos, and Julian Samora. Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Santa Barbara: McNally and Loftin Press, 1969.

Garth, Thomas R. "A Comparison of the Intelligence of Mexican and Mixed and Full-Blood Indian Children," Psychological Review, 1923, Vol. 30, pp. 388-401.

Garth, Thomas R. and Ethel Candor. "Musical Talent of Mexicans," American Journal of Psychology, 1937, Vol. 49, pp. 298-301.

Garth, Thomas R., Thomas H. Elson, and Margaret M. Morton. "The Administration of Non-Language Intelligence Tests to Mexicans," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, Vol. II, April-June, 1936, pp. 331-337.

Glick, Lawrence B. "The Right to Equal Opportunity," Chapter V in Samora, Julian, ed., *La Raza: Forgotten Americans*. South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

Goldberg, Meriam L., Harry A. Passow, and Joseph Justman. *The Effects of Ability Grouping*. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

Governor's Committee on Public School Education in Texas, *The Challenge and the Chance*. Austin, Texas, August 31, 1968.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman, et al. *The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Hansen, Morris H., William Hurwitz, and William G. Madow. *Sample Survey Methods and Theory*. New York: The Free Press, 1953.

Harvey, Louis F. "The Delinquent Mexican Boy," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 22, No. 3, April, 1949, pp. 149-157.

Heller, Celia. *Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads*. New York: Random House, 1966.

Helmstadter, G. C. *Principles of Psychological Measurement*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Hernandez, Luis F. *A Forgotten American*. New York, New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'Na' B'Rith, 1969.

Hickerson, Nathanial. "Participation by Negroes and Non-Negroes in the Formal and Informal Activities of a California High School." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1962.

Houston Chronicle, Houston, Texas, September 4, 1971.

Howe, Harold. "The Cowboy and the Indian," address given at the National Conference of Educational Opportunities, Austin, Texas, 1968.

Humphrey, Norman D. "The Concept of Culture in Social Class Work," *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. LXII, No. 1, September-October, 1941, pp. 54-55.

Hyman, Herbert. *Survey Design and Analysis*. Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Johnson, Henry S. and William J. Hernandez, et al. *Educating the Mexican American*. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1970.

Jones, W. R. "A Critical Study of Bilingualism and Non-Verbal Intelligence," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 30, 1960, pp. 71-77.

Keston, Morton J. and Carmina Jimenez. "A Study of the Performance on English and Spanish Editions of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test by Spanish-American Children," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, December, 1954, p. 263-272.

Keyserling, Arthur. *Progress or Poverty?* Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, April, 1964.

Kibbe, Pauline R. *Latin Americans in Texas*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: The University of New Mexico Press, 1946.

Kish, Leslie. *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1965.

Kluckhohn, Florence Rockwood and Fred O. Strodtbeck. *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.

Knowlton, Clark. "Patron-Peon Pattern Among the Spanish Americans of New Mexico," *Social Forces*, Vol. III, No. 6, October, 1962, pp. 211-220.

Madsen, William. *Mexican-Americans of South Texas*. San Francisco, California: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Manakian, C. "Measuring Intelligence on Reading Capacity of Spanish Speaking Children," *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 7, pp. 760-768.

Manuel, Herschel T. *Spanish Speaking Children of the Southwest*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1965.

Mexican American Study, Report 1: Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans In the Public Schools of the Southwest, Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights, April, 1971.

Mindiola, Tatcho. "The Mexican American Family." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Houston, 1970.

Nava, Raul. Mexican Americans: A Brief Look At Their History. New York: Anti Defamation League of B'Na' B'Rith, 1970.

Parsons, Theodore W., Jr. "Ethnic Cleavage in a California School." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University, August, 1965.

Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls and Samples. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Pasamanick, Benjamin. "The Intelligence of American Children of Mexican Parentage: A Discussion of Uncontrolled Variables," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, October, 1951, pp. 598-603.

Peal, Elizabeth and Wallace E. Lambert. "The Relations of Bilingualism to Intelligence," Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, Vol. 76, No. 27, 1962, pp. 1-21.

Pearl, Arthur and Frank Riesman. New Careers For the Poor. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Penalosa, Fernando, and Edward C. McDonagh. "Social Mobility in the Mexican American Community," Social Forces, Vol. III, No. 8, June, 1966.

Presidential Executive Order, Number 39540, is to be found in Keyserling, Arthur, Progress and Poverty. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, April, 1964.

Ramirez, A. R. A Survey of Elementary Teachers in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Unpublished survey, Rio Grande City Independent School District, Rio Grande City, Texas, 1966.

Riesman, F. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Rodriguez, Armando. "The Challenge for Educators," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. I, No. 2, November, 1970, pp. 18-19.

Rosenberg, Morris. The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books, Incorporated, 1968.

Salvatierra vs. Independent School District (Texas Civ. App. 33 S.W. 2nd 790, 1930).

Samora, Julian. "Conceptions of Health and Disease Among Spanish Americans," The American Catholic Sociológical Review, 1961, 22:314-323.

Sanchez, George. "History, Culture and Education," Chapter 1 in Samora, Julian, ed., La Raza: Forgotten Americans, South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

________. Forgotten People. Albuquerque, New Mexico: The University of New Mexico Press, 1940.

Saunders, Lyle. Cultural Differences and Medical Care: The Case of the Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954.

Senter, Donovan. "Acculturation Among New Mexican Villagers in Comparison to Adjustment Patterns of Other Spanish-Speaking Americans," Rural Sociology, March, 1945, pp. 219-232.

Senter, Donovan and Florence Hawley. "The Grammar School as the Basic Acculturating Influence for Native New Mexicans," Social Forces, May, 1946, pp. 20-34.

Talbert, Robert H. Spanish-Name People in the Southwest and West. For the Texas Good Neighbor Foundation. Fort Worth: The Manney Company, 1955.

Tetreau, E. D. "Social Aspects of Arizona's Farm Labor Problems," Sociology and Social Research, 1940, 24: 550-557.

Ulibarri, Horacio. "Teacher Awareness of Sociocultural Differences in Multicultural Classrooms," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. II, No. 3, October, 1960, pp. 126-135.

U. S. Department of Commerce. 1960 Census of Populations. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of The Census, 1960.

U. S. Department of Commerce. 1970 Advance Census Report. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of The Census, 1970.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Revised O.E.O. Instruction, 6004-16. Washington, D.C.: Office of Equal Opportunity, 1970.

Vaca, Nick G. "The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences, 1912-1970. Part I, 1912-35," El Grito, Vol. III, No. 3, pp. 3-24.

Watson, James B. and Julian Samora. "Subordinate Leadership in a Bicultural Community: An Analysis," American Sociological Review, August, 1954, pp. 136-150.

West, Guy A. "Race Attitudes Among Teachers in the Southwest," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, October-December, 1936, pp. 334-342.

Woods, Sister Frances Jerome. Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1956.

________. Mexican Ethnic Leadership in San Antonio, Texas. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, Inc., 1949.

Zurcher, Louis A., Susan Lee Zurcher, and Arnold Meadow. "Value Orientation, Role Conflict, and Alienation from Work: A Cross Cultural Study," American Sociological Review, Vol. II, No. 3, August, 1965.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES AND LETTERS: IN ENGLISH

STUDENTS' AND PARENTS' FORMS

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDY PROJECT

Dear Parent:

You have been selected as one who can give important help in a study of the education of Mexican-American students.

I grew up in Corpus Christi where I have been a student, a teacher, and a principal. Now, I am teaching at the University of Houston.

At the present time, I am doing a study in which I am talking to Americans of Mexican descent to find out how they feel about important things like schools, jobs, and housing. The only way to understand conditions is to actually talk to you and people like you and find out how they feel about things.

Later on, I, or one of my fellow workers, will come to talk to you. Our records will be strictly confidential and no one will see them except the scientific workers. Your answers will help me to write something which will be helpful to (both English speaking and Spanish speaking) teachers, to administrators, to parents, and to the public.

Your help will mean a lot to the Mexican-American students not only in Corpus Christi, but also in Texas. I shall ever be grateful to you for your cooperation.

Juan M. Flores
Doctoral Candidate

University of Houston
Mexican American Study Project
Houston, Texas
1971

Hello, my name is ____________________ and I'm with the University of Houston, Mexican American Study Project. We're doing a study in which we're talking to Americans of Mexican descent to find out how they feel about important things like schools, jobs, and housing. The only way to understand conditions is to actually talk to the people and find out how they feel about things. We really need and appreciate your help. Your answers will be strictly confidential, and no one will see them, except the scientific workers who count up the different answers.

Our questions cover several different kinds of things. We just want to know how you feel on certain things. It is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. Please feel free to stop and ask questions at any time.

University of Houston
Mexican American Study Project
Houston, Texas
1971

Interviewer__________________
time started _______________
time finished_______________
time elapsed _______________

Respondent's Name_________________________ Sex: M__ F__

Address___________________________________ Phone Number________

Position in Household: How many living at home? _______

_____ Head

_____ Spouse Sex of 9th grade student B__ G__

_____ Other (explain)

Education: (years of schooling completed--check all applicable)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

9 10 11 12 -- H.S. Graduate____ GED____

College: 1 2 3 4 College Graduate____

Post Graduate____

Commercial College____

Vocational Training____ Other____ (explain)

1. How long have you lived in your present house (apartment)?
   a. _____ 0-3 years
   b. _____ 4-6 years
   c. _____ 7-10 years
   d. _____ 10-20 years
   e. _____ all your life

2. Do most of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live in Corpus Christi?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

3. Do you have any relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters who live in another neighborhood other than this neighborhood?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

4. Do any of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live within walking distance of your home?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

5. (If yes to question 4) Which relatives live within walking distance? (Check all applicable)
   a. Grandparents_____
   b. Parents (either father or mother or both)_____
   c. Brother(s)_____
   d. Sister(s)_____
   e. Children_____
   f. Uncles_____
   g. Compadres_____

6. (If yes to question 4) How often do you talk to them?
   a. _____ every day
   b. _____ once or twice a week
   c. _____ once or twice a month
   d. _____ very little
   e. _____ almost never
   f. _____ never

7. Where were you born?
   a. Texas_____
   b. Mexico_____
   c. In the United States but not in Texas_____
      Where?_____

8. Where did you live last?
   a. In Corpus Christi_____
   b. Out of Corpus Christi_____

9. (If you lived outside of Corpus Christi) How long did you live there?
   a. _____ a few months
   b. _____ 1-3 years
   c. _____ 4-6 years
   d. _____ 7-9 years
   e. _____ more than 10 years

10. How did you move here?
   a. _____ came with parents
   b. _____ came with husband or wife
   c. _____ came alone to find work
   d. _____ came with friends
   e. _____ other - explain ______________________

11. Why did you decide to move to this part of Corpus Christi? (Check all applicable)
   a. _____ rent is inexpensive
   b. _____ close to work
   c. _____ couldn't rent or buy anywhere else
   d. _____ had relatives here
   e. _____ had friends here

12. Do you think there is any chance of you moving in the next 12 months?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

13. (If yes) Do you plan to stay in the Corpus Christi area?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

14. (If yes) Do you plan to stay in Texas?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

Here are some questions about the Spanish and English languages:

15. Do you speak Spanish?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

16. (If answer is yes) How well do you speak Spanish?
   a. Very well _____
   b. Well _____
   c. Fair _____
   d. Poor _____

17. Do you listen to radio programs from Mexico?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

18. (If answer is yes) Do you have any problem understanding them?
    a. no _____
    b. yes _____
    c. a little _____

19. Do you ever go to see Mexican movies?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

20. (If answer is yes) Do you have any problem understanding these movies?
    a. no _____
    b. yes _____
    c. a little _____

21. Do you ever read a newspaper, magazine or letters printed in Spanish?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

22. If your answer is yes, how well do you read?
    a. _____ very well
    b. _____ well
    c. _____ good
    d. _____ fair
    e. _____ poorly

23. Can you write in Spanish?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

24. If your answer is yes, how well do you write?
    a. _____ well
    b. _____ good
    c. _____ fair

25. Do you speak English?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

26. (If your answer is yes) Do you think your ability to speak Spanish has:
    a. _____ helped you to speak English?
    b. _____ not helped you to speak English?
    c. _____ made no difference?

27. Can you write in English?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

28. (If your answer is yes) Has your ability to speak Spanish
   a. ______ helped you to write in English?
   b. ______ not helped you to write in English?
   c. ______ made no difference?

29. Did you speak English before you entered school?
   a. yes ______
   b. no ______

30. Do your children speak both English and Spanish?
   a. yes ______
   b. no ______

31. What language did your children learn to speak first?
   a. ______ Spanish
   b. ______ English
   c. ______ Both

32. What language do your children understand better?
   a. ______ Spanish
   b. ______ English
   c. ______ Both equally the same

33. If your child speaks and understands both languages, do you think it is important for him to learn to read and write in Spanish as well as English?
   a. yes ______
   b. no ______

34. What language do you speak in your home?
   a. ______ Mostly Spanish
   b. ______ Mostly English
   c. ______ Only Spanish
   d. ______ Only English
   e. ______ Both

35. Do you think Bi-lingual Education will help your children more than just teaching them in one language?
   a. yes ______
   b. no ______
   c. I don't know ______

Here are some ways of looking at life:

36. Good luck is more important than hard work for success.
   a. ______ agree
   b. ______ disagree

37. Everytime I try to get ahead, something or someone stops me.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

38. People like me do not have much of a chance to be successful in life.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

39. Doing schoolwork makes the future easier.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

40. School will not help my children in the future.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

41. School will not help my children get a better job.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

42. People like me should not expect too much of life so that I will not be disappointed.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

43. Planning my future ahead of time is a waste of time because I cannot alter my future.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

44. People like me who are born poor will be poor all their lives.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

45. Men are always smarter than women.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

46. Men can do anything they want to do but the women should not.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

47. Women cannot always do what they want.
    a. _____ agree
    b. _____ disagree

48. Your family is more important than you.
   a. ______ agree
   b. ______ disagree

Here are some other ways of looking at life:

49. a. Some people believe it best to give most attention to what is happening now in the present. They say that the past has gone and the future is much too uncertain to count on.

b. Some people think that the ways of the past were the most right and the best, and as changes come things get worse.

c. Some people believe that it is the ways of the future which will be best, and they say that although there are sometime disappointments, change brings improvements in the long run.

Which one of these ways of looking at life do you think is best?
   a. ______
   b. ______
   c. ______

50. Three young people were talking about what they thought their families would one day be as compared with their fathers and mothers. They each said different things.

a. The first one said: "I expect my family to be better off in the future than the family of my father and mother if we work hard and play right. Things in this country usually get better for people."

b. The second one said: "I don't know whether my family will be better off, the same, or worse off than the family of my father and mother. Things always go up and down even if people do work hard. So no one can ever really tell how things will be."

c. The third one said: "I expect my family to be about the same as the family of my father and mother. The best way is to work hard and plan ways to keep up things as they have been in the past."

Which one of these young people do you think had the best idea?
   a. ______
   b. ______
   c. ______

51. How do you feel about the future of your children?
a. I really expect my children to have more than I have had if they work hard and plan right. There are always good chances for people who try.

b. I don't know whether my children will be better off, worse off, or just the same as I am. Things always go up and down even if one works hard, so, I can't really tell.

c. I expect my children to have just about the same as I have had.

Which idea do you agree with?
a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

52. How do you feel about raising children? Here are three different ideas.
a. Children should be taught the traditions of the past (the ways of the old people) because the old ways are best. When children do not follow the old ways things go wrong.

b. Children should be taught some of the old traditions (ways of the old people), but it is wrong to insist that they stick to these ways. It is necessary for children to learn about and accept whatever new ways will best help them get along in the world of today.

c. Children should not be taught much about past traditions at all except as an interesting story of what has gone before. Children would be better off when they are taught the things that will make them want to find out for themselves new ways of doing things to replace the old.

Which idea do you agree with?
a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

53. What would you most like your 9th grade son to do as a life work?
a. _____ professional (doctor, lawyer, pharmacist, nurse, teacher)
b. _____ managerial occupation (manager of some store)
c. _____ white collar (salesman, insurance man, secretary)
d. _____ skill or tradesman (printer, carpenter, mechanic)
e. _____ unskilled worker (laborer, construction)

54. What do you think he will really do if he finishes high school?
a. _____ professional
b. _____ managerial occupation
c. _____ white collar worker
d. _____ skill or tradesman
e. _____ unskilled
f. _____ armed service

55. What would you most like your 9th grade daughter to do as a life work?
a. _____ professional (doctor, lawyer, pharmacist, nurse, teacher)
b. _____ managerial occupation (manager of some store)
c. _____ white collar (salesman, insurance man, secretary)
d. _____ skill or tradesman (printer, carpenter, mechanic)
e. _____ unskilled worker (laborer, construction)

56. What do you think she will really do if she finishes high school?
a. _____ professional
b. _____ managerial occupation
c. _____ white collar worker
d. _____ skill or tradesman
e. _____ unskilled
f. _____ armed service

57. What do you think might keep your son or daughter from doing the work which you would most like him or her to do? (Check all appropriate).
a. _____ nothing special; excellent chances
b. _____ not enough ability
c. _____ not enough money
d. _____ not good enough in (his or her) studies
e. _____ fear of failure
f. _____ too little help from the family
g. _____ feeling that he or she does not have as good a chance as others
h. _____ sickness
i. _____ he or she would rather get a job
j. _____ some other reason

Here are some questions about education?

58. What do you think your child should do about school?
   a. _____ drop out and get a job
   b. _____ finish high school
   c. _____ finish high school and get a job
   d. _____ go to college
   e. _____ finish college and get a job

59. How many years of education do you think your child should have?
   a. _____ the same as you had
   b. _____ less than you had
   c. _____ more than you had

60. What do you think your child should get out of his education? (Check all appropriate)
   a. _____ learn to read, write, add, spell, and speak English
   b. _____ learn a special trade (plumber, mechanic, electrician, etc.)
   c. _____ learn to get along with people
   d. _____ all of the above
   e. _____ other (explain)

61. Do you think your daughters should try to get as much education as your sons do?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

62. If answer is No, why? (Check all appropriate)
   a. _____ girls belong in the home to learn housework
   b. _____ girls are not as smart as boys
   c. _____ girls do not need an education

63. Has a member of your immediate family_____ (Check all appropriate)
   a. _____ dropped out of school before high school
   b. _____ finished high school
   c. _____ dropped out of high school
   d. _____ entered college
   e. _____ finished college

64. Do you think your children should get as much education as they can?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

65. Here are some things that might be done by a husband or wife in the home. Think about your home as I read them to you. Are these things usually done by you, by your husband (wife) or by both of you? If neither, if it were done by one of you which would it be?

	Husband	Wife	Both	Neither--Husband might	Neither--Wife might	Neither--Both might	Don't know
1. Painting rooms in the house?							
2. Getting up at night to take care of the children if they cry?							
3. Deciding where to go for a holiday or celebration?							
4. Punishing the children if necessary?							
5. Picking out more expensive things like furniture or a car?							
6. Taking care of the children when they are sick?							
7. Making the payments or handles the finances?							
8. Buying the groceries?							
9. Washes the clothes?							
10. Goes to P.T.A. meetings?							
11. Managing the social affairs engaged in by the family?							
12. Taking care of the children every day?							
13. Does cooking?							
14. Does yard work?							

Income: Monthly__________ Weekly_________

Job No.________
Case No.________

Interviewer: Fill Out Immediately After Leaving

Fluency in language (vocabulary):

Spanish
______ Very fluent
______ Normally fluent
______ Broken Spanish

English
______ Very fluent
______ Normally fluent
______ Broken English

Did you have difficulty convincing -R- that he (she) should be interviewed?

No ______ Yes ______

How did you overcome the difficulty? What did you say?

____

____

Why do you think -R- hesitated to be interviewed?

____

____

Would you say that this was a poor interview, a fair interview, or an excellent interview?

______ Poor interview
______ Fair interview
______ Excellent interview

Why do you say that?

____

____

What other comments do you have that might help other interviewers?

____

____

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDY PROJECT

Dear Student:

You have been selected as one who could give important help in a study of the education of Mexican-American students.

I grew up in a Corpus Christi neighborhood just like you. I was a teacher, a principal, and at present, I am teaching at the University of Houston.

I need now to know how students themselves feel about different things. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. Please feel free to stop and ask questions at any time. Your responses or answers will help me to write something which will be helpful to (both English speaking and Spanish speaking) teachers, to administrators, to parents, and to the public. As you know, understanding is needed before improvement takes place.

Since this is a scientific study, your answers will be confidential and will only be seen by scientific workers who will analyze the answers.

Please turn in your reply sheets, and I shall be ever grateful for your help.

Juan M. Flores
Doctoral Candidate

University of Houston
Mexican American Study Project
1971

Name______________________________ Sex: M__ F__
Address_________________________________ Phone Number_________

Grades (All through school):
Mostly A's________
Mostly A's & B's_____
Mostly A's, B's, & C's_____
Mostly B's_____
Mostly B's & C's_____
Mostly B's, C's & D's_____
Mostly C's_____
Mostly C's & D's_____
Mostly D's_____
Mostly D's & F's_____

The following questions cover several different kinds of things. We just want to know how you feel on certain things. Remember this is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. You may begin.

1. How long have you lived in your present house (apartment)?
   a. _____ 0-3 years
   b. _____ 4-6 years
   c. _____ 7-10 years
   d. _____ 10-20 years
   e. _____ all your life

2. Do most of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live in Corpus Christi?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

3. Do you have any relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters who live in another neighborhood other than this neighborhood?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

4. Do any of your close relatives such as children, parents, brothers, and sisters live within walking distance of your home?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

5. (If yes to question 4) Which relatives live within walking distance? (Check all applicable)
   a. Grandparents_____
   b. Parents (either father or mother or both)_____
   c. Brother(s)_____
   d. Sister(s)_____
   e. Children_____
   f. Uncles_____
   g. Compadres_____

6. (If yes to question 4) How often do you talk to them?
   a. _____ every day
   b. _____ once or twice a week
   c. _____ once or twice a month
   d. _____ very little
   e. _____ almost never
   f. _____ never

7. Where were you born?
   a. Texas_____
   b. Mexico_____
   c. In the United States but not in Texas_____
   Where?_____

8. Where did you live last?
   a. In Corpus Christi_____
   b. Out of Corpus Christi_____

9. (If you lived outside of Corpus Christi) How long did you live there?
   a. _____ a few months
   b. _____ 1-3 years
   c. _____ 4-6 years
   d. _____ 7-9 years
   e. _____ more than 10 years

10. How did you move here?
   a. _____ came with parents
   b. _____ came with husband or wife
   c. _____ came alone to find work
   d. _____ came with friends
   e. _____ other - explain________________________

11. Why did you decide to move to this part of Corpus Christi? (Check all applicable)
   a. _____ rent is inexpensive
   b. _____ close to work
   c. _____ couldn't rent or buy anywhere else
   d. _____ had relatives here
   e. _____ had friends here
   f. _____ came with parents

12. Do you think there is any chance of you moving in the next 12 months?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

13. (If yes) Do you plan to stay in the Corpus Christi area?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

14. (If yes) Do you plan to stay in Texas?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

Here are some questions about the Spanish and English languages:

15. Do you speak Spanish?
   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

16. (If answer is yes) How well do you speak Spanish?
   a. Very well _____
   b. Well _____
   c. Fair _____
   d. Poor _____

17. Do you listen to radio programs from Mexico?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

18. (If answer is yes) Do you have any problem understanding them?
    a. no _____
    b. yes _____
    c. a little _____

19. Do you ever go to see Mexican movies?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

20. (If answer is yes) Do you have any problem understanding these movies?
    a. no _____
    b. yes _____
    c. a little _____

21. Do you prefer Mexican or American movies?
    a. Mexican _____
    b. American _____
    c. Both _____
    d. Makes no difference _____
    e. Other _____ (explain) ______________________

22. Do you watch Mexican programs on T.V.?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

23. If answer is yes, do you have any problem understanding these programs?
    a. no _____
    b. yes _____
    c. a little _____

24. Do you prefer Mexican or American T.V. programs?
    a. Mexican _____
    b. English _____
    c. Both _____
    d. Makes no difference _____

25. Do you ever read a newspaper, magazine or letters printed in Spanish?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

26. If your answer is yes, how well do you read?
    a. ______ very well
    b. ______ well
    c. ______ good
    d. ______ fair
    e. ______ poorly

27. Can you write in Spanish?
    a. yes ______
    b. no ______

28. If your answer is yes, how well do you write?
    a. ______ well
    b. ______ good
    c. ______ fair

29. Do you speak English?
    a. yes ______
    b. no ______

30. (If your answer is yes) Do you think your ability to speak Spanish has:
    a. ______ helped you to speak English
    b. ______ not helped you to speak English?
    c. ______ made no difference?

31. Can you write in English?
    a. yes ______
    b. no ______

32. (If your answer is yes) Has your ability to speak Spanish
    a. ______ helped you to write in English?
    b. ______ not helped you to write in English?
    c. ______ made no difference?

33. Did you speak English before you entered school?
    a. yes ______
    b. no ______

34. Do you speak both English and Spanish?
    a. yes ______
    b. no ______

35. What language did you learn to speak first?
    a. Spanish ______
    b. English ______
    c. Both ______

36. Which language do you understand better?
    a. _____ Spanish
    b. _____ English
    c. _____ Both equally the same

37. If you speak and understand both languages, do you think it is important for you to learn to read and write in Spanish as well as English?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____

38. What language do you speak in your home?
    a. _____ Mostly Spanish
    b. _____ Mostly English
    c. _____ Only Spanish
    d. _____ Only English
    e. _____ Both

39. Do you think Bi-lingual Education will help students like yourself more than just teaching them in one language?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____
    c. I don't know _____

40. Do you think Headstart will help students like yourself?
    a. yes _____
    b. no _____
    c. I don't know _____

41. Would you rather have a male or female teacher?
    a. male _____
    b. female _____
    c. makes no difference _____

42. Would you rather have a Mexican-American, Negro or Anglo teacher?
    a. Negro _____
    b. Mexican American _____
    c. Anglo _____
    d. Other _____ Explain _______________
    e. Makes no difference _____

Here are some ways of looking at life:

43. Good luck is more important than hard work for success.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

44. Everytime I try to get ahead, something or someone stops me.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

45. People like me do not have much of a chance to be successful in life.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

46. Doing schoolwork makes the future easier.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

47. School will not help me in the future.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

48. School will not help me get a better job.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

49. You should not expect too much of life so that you will not be disappointed.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

50. Planning your future ahead of time is a waste of time because you can not alter your future.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

51. If you are born poor you will be poor all your life.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

52. Men are always smarter than women.
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

53. Men can do anything they want to do but the women should not
  a. _____ agree
  b. _____ disagree

Which one of these young people do you think had the best idea?

a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

58. How do you feel about the future of your children?
a. I really expect my children to have more than I have had if they work hard and plan right. There are always good chances for people who try.

b. I don't know whether my children will be better off, worse off, or just the same as I am. Things always go up and down even if one works hard, so, I can't really tell.

c. I expect my children to have just about the same as I have had.

Which idea do you agree with?

a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

59. How do you feel about raising children. Here are three different ideas.
a. Children should be taught the traditions of the past (the ways of the old people) because the old ways are best. When children do not follow the old ways things go wrong.

b. Children should be taught some of the old traditions (ways of the old people), but it is wrong to insist that they stick to these ways. It is necessary for children to learn about and accept whatever new ways will best help them get along in the world of today.

c. Children should not be taught much about past traditions at all except as an interesting story of what has gone before. Children would be better off when they are taught the things that will make them want to find out for themselves new ways of doing things to replace the old.

Which idea do you agree with?

a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

60. What would you most like to do as a life work?
a. _____ professional (doctor, lawyer, pharmacist, nurse, teacher)
b. _____ managerial occupation (manager of some store)
c. _____ white collar (salesman, insurance man, secretary)
d. _____ skill or tradesman (printer, carpenter, mechanic)
e. _____ unskilled worker (laborer, construction)

61. What do you think you will really do if you finish high school?
a. _____ professional
b. _____ managerial occupation
c. _____ white collar worker
d. _____ skill or tradesman
e. _____ unskilled
f. _____ armed service

62. What do you think might keep you from doing the work which you would most like to do? (Check all applicable).
a. _____ nothing special; excellent chances
b. _____ not enough ability
c. _____ not enough money
d. _____ not good enough in your studies
e. _____ fear of failure
f. _____ too little help from the family
g. _____ feeling that he or she does not have as good a chance as others
h. _____ sickness
i. _____ you would rather get a job
j. _____ some other reason (explain) ______________

Here are some questions about education:

63. What do you think you should do about school?
a. _____ drop out and get a job
b. _____ finish high school
c. _____ finish high school and get a job
d. _____ go to college
e. _____ finish college and get a job

64. How many years of education do you think your future children should have?
a. _____ the same as you had
b. _____ less than you had
c. _____ more than you had

65. What do you think your future children should get out of his education? (Check all applicable)
    a. _____ learn to read, write, add, spell, and speak English
    b. _____ learn a special trade (plumber, mechanic, electrician, etc.)
    c. _____ learn to get along with people
    d. _____ all of the above
    e. _____ other (explain) _______________

66. Do you think your future daughters should try to get as much education as your sons do?
    a. _____ yes
    b. _____ no

67. If answer is No, why? (Check all applicable)
    a. _____ girls belong in the home to learn housework
    b. _____ girls are not as smart as boys
    c. _____ girls do not need an education

68. Has a member of your immediate family_____ (Check all appropriate)
    a. _____ dropped out of school before high school
    b. _____ finished high school
    c. _____ dropped out of high school
    d. _____ entered college
    e. _____ finished college

69. Do you think your future children should get as much education as they can?
    a. _____ yes
    b. _____ no

70. Here are some things that might be done by a husband or wife in the home. Think about your home as you read them. Are these things usually done by your father, by your mother, or by both? If neither, if it were done by one of them, which would it be?

	Husband	Wife	Both	Neither--Husband might	Neither--Wife might	Neither--Both might	Don't know
1. Painting rooms in the house?							
2. Getting up at night to take care of the children if they cry?							
3. Deciding where to go for a holiday or celebration?							
4. Punishing the children if necessary?							
5. Picking out more expensive things like furniture or a car?							
6. Taking care of the children when they are sick?							
7. Making the payments or handles the finances?							
8. Buying the groceries?							
9. Washes the clothes?							
10. Goes to P.T.A. meetings?							
11. Managing the social affairs engaged in by the family?							
12. Taking care of the children every day?							
13. Does cooking?							
14. Does yard work?							

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE AND LETTER: IN SPANISH

PARENTS' FORM

Estimado padre de familia:

Usted ha sido elégido como una persona que me pueda ofrecer ayuda importante para el desarrollo de un estudio de los méxico-americanos.

Yo he sido estudiante, maestro, y director de escuela en Corpus Christi. Hoy me encuentro enseñando en la Universidad de Houston.

En este momento estoy realizando un estudio que aclarará algunas cosas importantes. Quiero saber que es lo que piensan los méxico-americanos acerca de las escuelas, de los trabajos y empleos en Corpus Christi y de las casas en que viven. Para mejor comprender sus sentimientos y opiniones deseo hablar con Usted y con otros como Usted.

En unos cuantos días uno de mis compañeros, o yo mismo, le visitarimos para hacerle algunas preguntas. Todo lo que Usted nos conteste lo puede hacer con la mayor confianza. Sus respuestas serán usadas exclusivamente por mí para terminar el estudio que estoy haciendo.

Anticipando nuestra visita, quiero expresarle mis más sinceras gracias.

Juan Flores

UNIVERSIDAD DE HOUSTON
PROYECTO DE ESTUDIO MEXICOAMERICANO
HOUSTON, TEXAS
- 1971-

Buenos dias, yo me llamo_________________________,
y estoy en la Universidad de Houston, trabajando con el proyecto de estudios mexicoamericanos. Estamos haciendo un estudio, en el cual hablamos con gente como usted, con personas mexicoamericanas. Queremos saber su opinión acerca de varias cosas de importancia, como lo son: la escuela, los trabajos, y las viviendas.

Para poder comprender mejor el modo de vivir de hoy en dia, conviene venir a entrevistar a personas como usted. Necesitamos su cooperación al hacerle estas preguntas, y queremos que las conteste con toda franqueza. Queda entendido que lo que usted diga es confidencial y nadie verá las respuestas a no ser la persona indicada.

Vamos hacerle preguntas acerca de diferentes cosas, y queremos saber simplemente su opinión. Esto no es ninguna prueba o ningún examen. Si usted tiene alguna pregunta, yo trataré de contestársela.

UNIVERSIDAD DE HOUSTON
PROYECTO DE ESTUDIOS MEXICOAMERICANOS
HOUSTON, TEXAS
- 1971 -

Entrevistador: ____________________

Comenzó: ____________________

Concluyó: ____________________

Tiempo: ____________________

Nombre: ____________________ Sexo: ______ M ______ F

Dirección: ____________________ Telefono: __________

En esta casa usted es:

____________________ la cabeza del hogar.

____________________ el esposo.

____________________ la esposa

____________________ otra relación (explicar) __________

Cuántas personas viven aquí? ________

Si alguien va a 9^{o} grado en la escuela, a que sexo pertenece? ____

A que grado llegó usted en la escuela? (Circule el aplicable):

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Terminó High School: ____________________ G.E.D: ______________

Universidad: __________ 1 2 3 4 Graduó: ______________

La maestría: __________ Escuela comericial: ______________

Entrenamiento vocacional: __________ Otrá escuela: ________

Explicar: ____

1. Cuánto tiempo lleva usted viviendo en su casa/apartamento actual?
    a. _____0 - 3 años.
    b. _____4 - 6 años.
    c. _____7 -10 años.
    d. _____11-20 años.
    e. _____toda la vida.

2. Sus familiares allegados (hijos, padres de familia, hermanos o hermanas) tambien viven en Corpus Christi?
    a. _____sí
    b. _____no

3. Tiene usted familiares allegados (como los de la pregunta anterior) que vivan en otro barrio en Corpus Christi?
    a. _____sí
    b. _____no

4. Tiene usted familiares como lo ya mencionados que vivan tan cerca de aquí que se puedan visitar a pie?
    a. _____sí
    b. _____no

5. Si contesto "sí" a la #4, qué familiares viven cerca?
    a. abuelos:________
    b. uno o ambos padres de familia:__________________
    c. hermanos:____________
    d. hermanas:____________
    e. hijos:_______________
    f. tíos:________________
    g. compadres:___________

6. Cada que tiempo habla usted con los familiares mencionados en la pregunta #5?
    a. _________ todos los días.
    b. _________ uno o dos veces por semana.
    c. _________ una o dos veces por mes.
    d. _________ muy pocas veces.
    e. _________ casi nunca.
    f. _________ nunca.

7. Donde nació usted?
    a. En Texas________
    b. En México_______
    c. En los Estados Unidos pero no en Texas___________
    d. Otro lugar:______________________________________

8. Dónde vivió usted anteriormente?
    a. En Corpus Christi:_______
    b. Fuera de Corpus Christi:__________

9. (Si usted vivió fuera de Corpus Christi) Qué tiempo vivió usted ahí?
   a. _____ unos meses.
   b. _____ 1 - 3 años.
   c. _____ 4 - 6 años.
   d. _____ 7 - 9 años.
   e. _____ mas de 10 años.

10. Cómo vino usted a Corpus Christi?
   a. _____ vino con sus padres?
   b. _____ vino con su esposo/esposa?
   c. _____ vino solo/sola en busca de trabajo?
   d. _____ vino con amigos o amigas?
   e. _____ otro motivo: Explicar_______________________

11. Por qué decidió usted venir a vivir aquí?
   (Marque más de una si es necesario)
   a. _______________ la renta es más barata
   b. _______________ vivo cerca del trabajo
   c. _______________ no puedo rentar o comprar en otra parte del pueblo
   d. _______________ tengo familiares aquí
   e. _______________ tengo amistades aquí

12. Piensa usted mudarse en los próximos 12 meses (un año)?
   a. sí ______
   b. no ______

13. Si se muda - se quedaría usted en el area de Corpus Christi?
   a. sí ______
   b. no ______

14. Si se queda - viviría usted en el estado de Texas?
   a. sí ______
   b. no ______

-LAS SIGUIENTES PREGUNTAS SON ACERCA

DEL ESPAÑOL Y EL INGLÉS-

15. Habla usted español?
   a. sí ______
   b. no ______

16. (Si la respuesta es "sí") Describa en la forma que usted habla el español.
    a. lo hablo muy bien ________________
    b. lo hablo bien ________________
    c. lo hablo con algunos errores ____________
    d. lo hablo mal ____________

17. Escucha usted programas de radio de Mexico?
    a. ______ sí
    b. ______ no

18. Si los escucha, tiene dificultad para entenderles?
    a. ______ sí
    b. ______ no
    c. ______ un poco

19. Ve usted películas Mexicanas (o en español)?
    a. ______ sí
    b. ______ no

20. Si ve películas en español, tiene dificultad para entenderlas?
    a. ______ sí
    b. ______ no
    c. ______ un poco

21. Lee usted periódicos, revistas o cartas en español?
    a. ______ sí
    b. ______ no

22. Si usted lee español, describa la forma en que usted lo lee:
    a. ______ lo leo bastante bien
    b. ______ lo leo bien
    c. ______ lo leo con pocos errores
    d. ______ leo mal el español

23. Puede usted escribir en español?
    a. ______ sí
    b. ______ no

24. Si escribe español, cuál de las siguientes frases clasifican mejor la manera en oue usted lo escribe?
    a. ______ lo escribo bien
    b. ______ lo escribo con pocos errores
    c. ______ lo escribo mal

25. Habla usted inglés?
    a. si ______
    b. no ______

26. Si habla usted inglés, cree que el hablar español le ha:
    a. ______ ayudado hablar en inglés?
    b. ______ a escribir en inglés?
    c. ______ ni una cosa ni otra

27. Puede usted escribir en inglés?
    a. sí ______
    b. no ______

28. El hecho de que usted habla español:
    a. ______ le ayuda a usted a escribir en ingles?
    b. ______ no le ha ayudado a escribir en inglés?
    c. ______ ni una cosa ni otra.

29. Hablaba usted inglés antes de ir a la escuela (desde niño)?
    a. sí ______
    b. no ______

30. Sus hijos hablan inglés y español?
    a. sí ______
    b. no ______

31. Qué idioma habló primero su niño/niña?
    a. ______ español
    b. ______ inglés
    c. ______ los dos idiomas

32. Qué idioma entienden mejor sus hijos?
    a. ______ español
    b. ______ inglés
    c. ______ los dos idiomas igualmente

33. Si su hijo/hija habla y entiende los dos idiomas, cree usted que sea importante que él aprenda a leer y escribir en español asi como en inglés?
    a. sí ______
    b. no ______

34. Qué idioma hablan ustedes en casa?
    a. ________ casi todo en español
    b. ________ casi todo en inglés
    c. ________ solamente español
    d. ________ solamente inglés
    e. ________ los dos idiomas

35. Cree usted que una educación bilingue (dos lenguas) sea mas beneficiosa para sus hijos que solamente enseñarle una?
    a. _____ sí
    b. _____ no
    c. _____ no se

- Está usted de acuerdo - o no - acerca de éstas frases de la vida?

36. Para tener éxito en la vida, más vale la buena suerte que el trabajar duro.
    a. _____ estoy de acuerdo   b. _____ no lo estoy

37. Siempre que intento hacer algo, alguien o algo me detiene.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

38. Las personas como yo no tienen oportunidad en la vida de tener éxito.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

39. Hacer la tarea de la escuela, contribuye a un futuro más fácil.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

40. La escuela no le sirve a uno para el futuro.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

41. La escuela no sirve para poder conseguir mejor trabajos.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

42. No hay que confiar mucho en el porvenir, porque quizás no llegue.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

43. Para que sirve hacer planes para el futuro? todo será en vano puesto que nuestro destino ya está determinado.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

44. Personas como yo que nacen pobre, serán pobre toda la vida.
    a. _____ de acuerdo
    b. _____ no estoy de acuerdo

45. Un hombre es siempre mas vivo que una mujer.
    a. ______ de acuerdo
    b. ______ no estoy de acuerdo

46. Un hombre si puede hacer lo que el quiere, pero no una mujer.
    a. ______ de acuerdo
    b. ______ no estoy de acuerdo

47. La mujer no siempre puede hacer lo qué quiere.
    a. ______ de acuerdo
    b. ______ no de acuerdo

48. Es mas importante toda la familia (en conjunto) que solamente un miembro de esa familia.
    a. ______ de acuerdo
    b. ______ no de acuerdo

-ESTAS SON OTRAS FORMAS DE VER LA VIDA:

49. Hay personas que creen que vale más vivir solamente en el presente. Dicen que lo que pasó, pasó, que no hay que contar con el futuro incierto.

    b. Hay personas que creen que el tiempo pasado fué mejor, y que a medida que las cosas cambian se ponen peor.

    c. Hay personas que creen que el futuro será lo mejor, que aunque a veces hay quebrantos, a la larga los cambios del futuro traeran mejoras.

    -Con cuál de las tres frases está usted de acuerdo?
    a. ______
    b. ______
    c. ______

50. Tres muchachos jovenes estaban un día hablando y pensando en lo distinto que iba a ser la vida de sus familias en comparación con la vida de sus padres.
    Cada uno pensaba diferente:

    a. El primero decía: "Yo espero que mi familia tenga un futuro mejor que el de mis padres, trabajamos duro y hacemos buenos planes. En este país, las cosas se mejoran para casi todas las personas."

    b. El segundo muchacho pensaba asi: "Yo no sé si mi familia, en comparación con mis padres, lo pasará mejor, del mismo modo, o peor que como lo han pasado mis padres. Las cosas se mejoran y también se empeoran, a pesar que la gente trabaje mucho. Uno nunca puede saber como van a estar las cosas.

c. El tercero decía: "Yo espero que mi familia no sea muy diferente a la familia de mis padres. Lo mejor es trabajar y hacer planes para vivir una vida asi como la que hemos vivido nosotros.

Cual de estos tres muchachos cree usted que tenga el mejor punto de vista acerca de la vida?
a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

51. Qué cree usted acerca del futuro de sus hijos?

a. Cree usted de veras que sus hijos tendrán más de lo que ustedes han tenido si trabajan duro y si planean bien? Siempre hay oportunidad para quien quiera lograrla.

b. Usted no sabe si sus hijos lo pasarán mejor, lo mismo que usted ahora, o peor que usted. Las cosas se ponen mejor o peor, no importa lo duro que uno trabaje; en realidad, uno no puede acertar.

c. Usted cree que sus hijos tendrán una vida mas o menos como la de usted ahora.

Con cuál de las tres ideas está usted de acuerdo?
a. ______
b. ______
c. ______

52. Cuál es su opinión de cómo criar sus niños? Lea las siguientes opiniones y escoja la que le parezca mejor a Ud.

a. A los niños se les debe enseñar las ideas de los viejos; porque las ideas viejas son mejores. Cuando los niños no siguen las viejas costumbres, las cosas caminan mal.

b. A los niños se les debe enseñar algunas de las tradiciones de los viejos, pero no es bueno que ellos sigan esta manera vieja de vivir. Mejor es que los niños aprendan y acepten las nuevas formas de vivir de hoy, las que mejor les sirvan para vivir hoy día.

c. A los niños no se les debe enseñar las maneras tradicionales, a no ser que sea no mas en cuentos. Es major que se les enseñe a tener curiosidad para que ellos, de por si, búsquen modos nuevos de hacer las cosas.

Con cuál de las tres ideas esta usted de acuerdo?
a. _____
b. _____
c. _____

53. Qué le gustaría a usted que su hijo que está en noveno grado hiciera en la vida?
a. qué tenga una profesión (doctor, abogado, farmaceútico enfermero, profesor, etc.)
b. Gerente (administrador) de una tienda
c. trabajo experto (carpintero, trabajo de prensa, etc)
d. trabajo de oficina; Agente o Secretaria
e. trabajo de bracero o de peón
f. En el Servicio Militar

54. Qué cree usted que va a llegar a ser en realidad, si termina el high school?
a. _____ profesional
b. _____ administrador
c. _____ trabajo experto
d. _____ trabajo de oficina
e. _____ Servicio Militar

55. Qué quisiera usted que su hija que en noveno grado hiciera en la vida?
a. _____ profesional
b. _____ gerente de una tienda
c. _____ trabajo de oficina
d. _____ trabajo de bracero
e. _____ Secretaria

56. Qué cree usted que va a llegar a ser en realidad, si termina el high school?
a. _____ profesional
b. _____ administrador
c. _____ trabajo experto
d. _____ trabajo de oficina
e. _____ Servicio Militar

57. Qué cree usted que vaya a impedir (o a estorbar) para que su hijo/hija no consiga (no logre) hacer lo que usted le gustaria que hiciera?
-Si hay mas de una respuesta indique las que sean _____ necesaria-

a. _____ nada lo impide las oportunidades son excelentes.
b. _____ falta de habilidad
c. _____ falta de dinero
d. _____ no es aplicado (a) en sus estudios
e. _____ teme fracasar

f. _____ la familia no le podrá ayudar bastante
g. _____ teme que a el/ella no le den la misma oportunidad.
que a otros.
h. _____ por enfermedad
i. _____ él/ella prefiere trabajar
j. _____ otra razón no mencionada aquí

LAS SIGUIENTES OPINIONES SON ACERCA DE LA EDUCACIÓN:

58. Qué cree usted que su niño debe hacer acerca de la educación?
a. _____ dejar la escuela y ponerse a trabajar.
b. _____ terminar el High School
c. _____ terminar el High School y ponerse a trabajar
d. _____ ir a la Universidad
e. _____ terminar la Universidad y ponerse a trabajar

59. Cuántos años de escuela cree usted que su hijo debiera tener?
a. _____ tantos como tuvo usted?
b. _____ menos de los que usted tuvo?
c. _____ mas de los que usted llegó a tener?

60. Para qué cree usted que le va a servir la educatión a su hijo?

a. _____ para poder leer, escribir y hablar inglés
además de saber cómo sumar y restar
b. _____ para que aprenda una carrera como las do
plomero, mecánico, electricista, etc.
c. _____ para darse a entender con la gente.
d. _____ todas las razones arriba mencionades.
e. _____ otra razón (explicar: _____________________)

61. Cree usted que sus hijas deberán recibir tanta educación
cómo la que reciben sus hijos?
a. _____ sí
b. _____ no

62. Si dijo "no" - cuál de estas razones le parece mejor?
a. _____ a las muchachas les toca quedarse en casa
trabajando.
b. _____ las muchachas no son tan inteligentes como los
muchachos.
c. _____ las muchachas no necesitan una educacion formal

63. Cuál (-es) de las siguientes cosas les ha pasado a un miembro de su familia inmediata (padres, hermanos, hijos):
    a. _____ dejar la escuela antes de terminar High School
    b. _____ terminó High School
    c. _____ dejar High School antes de terminarlo
    d. _____ entró a la Universidad
    e. _____ terminó la Universidad

64. Cree usted que sus hijos debieran tener tanta educación como ellos quieran?
    a. _____ sí
    b. _____ no

65. Voy a mencionar trabajos que se hacen en la casa, y quiero que me diga si en la casa los hace el esposo, la esposa o los dos? Si lo hiciera solamente uno de los dos, quien sería? o si ninguno de los dos los hiciera.

	Esposo	Esposa	Ambos (los dos)	Ninguno de los dos Quizas el esposo	Ninguno de los dos Quizas la esposa	Ninguno do los dos Quizas ambos (los dos)	No se
1. Pintar los cuartos de la casa?							
2. Levantarse durante la noche a ver por qué lloran los niños?							
3. Quién decide a dónde ir en un día de fiesta?							
4. Castigar a los niños si es necesario?							
5. Escoger los muebles de la casa, un carro (artículos caros)							
6. Cuidar los niños cuando están enfermos?							
7. Hacer los pagos o cuidar el dinero de la semana o del mes?							
8. Comprar la comida?							
9. Lavar la ropa?							
10. Ir a las juntas de P.T.A.?							
11. Quién guía las obligaciones sociales de la familia?							
12. Cuidar los niños todos los días?							
13. Hacer la comida?							
14. Trabajar en el jardin o patio? (cuidar las plantas)							

VITA

VITA

Census: Juan M. Flores, born in Corpus Christi, Texas, on January 12, 1937, son of Felix and Guadalupe R. Flores.

Education: Graduated from Roy Miller High School, Corpus Christi, Texas. Received Associate of Arts from Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, 1961. Earned a Bachelor of Science in 1963 and a Masters of Science in 1966 from Texas A&I University in Kingsville, Texas.

Experience: Personnel Service, Houston Independent School District, present; Teaching Fellow, College of Education, University of Houston, 1969-1972; Elementary Principal, Corpus Christi, Texas, 1966-1969; Headstart Record Officer, Corpus Christi, Texas, summer, 1968; Elementary Teacher, Corpus Christi, Texas, 1963-1966.